This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Ger. 1419. e 1756
15

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

## A Magazine of Christian Literature,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO

THE REVEALED FUTURE OF THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD.

---

VOLUME XV.

BEING VOLUME V. OF THE NEW SERIES.

---

LONDON:
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1878.

Digitized by Google

LONDON
PRINTED BY CHALONER AND COOKE,
OXFORD ARMS PASSAGE, E.C.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS OF VOL. XV.


PAGE

A Few More Words on Theology. . . . . 104
Anglo-Saxons Not Israelites . . . . . 361
Another Word "On Churches" . . . . . 532
Apocalyptic Eschatology . . . . . 149
Argumentum ad Hominem . . . . . 8
A Witness of the Last Century . . . . . 178
Bright Side of Prophecy . . . . . 337
Canon Garbett on the Immortality of the Soul, 60, 126, 172, 256, 319, 366
Cherubic Phenomena . . . . . 118
Christianity in Solution . . . . . 25
Christ's Mission to Hades . . . . . 106
Conditional Immortality . . . . . 225, 312
Contrast of the Ages . . . . . 145
Correspondence 43, 92, 185, 237, 333, 382, 425, 476, 522, 566
Cyprus in Sacred Story . . . . . 433
Death the Entire Extinction of Being . . . . . 13
Dogma of Universal Salvation . . . . . 391, 461
Dr. Parker on Immortality . . . . . 304, 344
Dr. Petavel . . . . . 131, 221
Eternal Torment *versus* The Atonement . . . . 474
Feed My Sheep . . . . . 457
First Step in Jewish Restoration . . . . . 481
Fundamental Christianity. . . . . 495
Hope of the Church . . . . . 97
Idolatry . . . . . 339
Immortality . . . . . 473
In Memoriam: Henry Dunn . . . . . 198
"Israel of God" . . . . . 507
"I Whisper" . . . . . 423
Jewels and Property . . . . . 67
Justice and Love of God . . . . . 414
Last Words on Psa. cix. . . . . 167
Literature . 46, 95, 189. 237, 335, 383, 428, 679, 525, 568
Man in Death Unconscious . . . . . 292
Many and Few Stripes . . . . . 4
Matthew xxv. 46 . . . . . 224
Maude on the Resurrection . . . . 231, 263, 327, 355
Midnight Hour . . . . . 514
Musings on Mortality . . . . . 200
Mutual Help of Christian People . . . . . 289


Digitized by Google

PAGE

New Year . . . . . 1
Note . . . . . 527
Note on the terms Hell, Sheol, and Hades . . . 288
Notes and Comments . . . . 441, 520, 564
Notices . . 47, 96, 192, 239, 336, 384, 431, 525, 569

On Churches . . . . . 488
On Theology . . . . . 81
Our Mother Tongue . . . . . 214, 281

Poetry . 71, 118, 149, 166, 213, 349, 400, 444, 470, 513, 554
Predicted Millennium . . . . . 396
Professor Torrence on Future Punishment . . . 35
Promise to Overcomers . . . . . 534

Resurrection of Christ . . . . . 241
Resurrection of the Dead . . . . 418, 467
Re-translations . . . . . 213, 311

Scripture Doctrine of Regeneration . . . . 550
Scripture Questions and Answers . . . . 566
Second Psalm, a Prophetic Poem . . . . 555
Shaking of the Heavens . . . . . 49
Son of Man Judging the Nations . . . . 401, 445
Special Editorial Address . . . . . 528

Temporal Death not Total Extinction . . . . 135
The Divine Sentence on Sin . . . . 270, 375
The Elect and the Nations . . . . . 276
The Fall: Its Object and Result . . . . 13
"The Israel of God" . . . . . 507
The Tree of Life . . . . . 385, 449
The Turkish War and the Fall of Plevna . . . 205
Things Which Must Shortly Come to Pass, 56, 112, 161, 250, 298, 349, 406, 500, 542
Thomas Dekkar's Undying Worm . . . . . 519

Unity of the Spirit . . . . . 154

Visit of the Wise Men to Bethlehem . . . . 538

What are You Looking For? . . . . . 87
Whose are the Curses of Psa. cix.? . . . 18, 419

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

JANUARY, 1878.

## THE NEW YEAR.

IT is not for man to say how many years may come and go, with all their varied yet ever certain characteristics of joy and sorrow, before God's promised year, when he shall make all things new, shall pour its glorious light over a rejoicing creation. But that it will come we are perfectly certain; for we have divine assurances to that effect; and every brief year of present time, as it comes, passes, and disappears, brings the golden age so much nearer. As we pass the links in the long chain one by one, we approach the last of the series which will bring with it the long looked for jubilee when "the mystery of God shall be finished."

There is much in the state of the world and the Church to indicate a growing restlessness at the heart of both. Never were there so many schemes proposed as at present to improve ecclesiastical matters, and to bring the moral influence of the Church to bear upon the world. Fresh organisations are springing up with unexampled rapidity, each putting forth its best arguments to secure a large constituency with that money power which is always supposed to be essential to success. Hardly a week passes without the birth of a new "society" as a grand discovery for the realisation of some momentous object; surprise, of course, being expressed that the idea had not found embodiment long ago among intelligent men. If we are accused of indifference to the success of Christian labour, we shall pay no attention to the accusation, simply because it will be destitute of truth; but is not this amazing multiplication of schemes, plans, unions, boards, conferences, societies, congresses, and so forth, a sign of weakness rather than of strength? When so many physicians are called in, the conclusion is obvious that there is something seriously wrong with the patient. The prescriptions, too, are wonderfully heterogeneous; some of them indeed so startling as to excite the suspicion that murder is considered the surest act of mercy. If rank poison is administered, it is a matter



Digitized by Google

of certainty that no further advice will be needed. The death of the Church will of course end her troubles!

Among the latest empiricisms are two which are mournfully suggestive of the mental confusion, not to say judicial blindness, of some who profess themselves patrons of light and truth and humanity. One of these is the creation of a "church" on the broad principle of human brotherhood, with the ethics of the Gospel—as far as may be found practically convenient—as the guide of life; but with an entire surrender of belief in the miraculous element in the Gospels, and in the atonement, the divinity, and resurrection of JESUS CHRIST. Those who propound this swift way out of our ecclesiastical labyrinth would feel themselves dishonoured by the suggestion that they cannot fairly be reckoned among believers in the Word of God. They are pastors and teachers—their flocks be pitied!—and it is avowedly in the interests of "Christianity" that they commend this *very* "broad church" idea to the good will of their countrymen.

A union formed on this basis is quite likely to attract the "natural man," for it gets rid of all the characteristic peculiarities of the Gospel, and levels the side walls of the narrow way with the dust. It requires no regeneration, no self-crucifixion, no indwelling of the Spirit, and no sympathy with the desire of Paul to know "the power of Christ's resurrection." The resurrection being set aside as non-essential to fellowship in this "Church," of course Paul is not qualified for membership. He, indeed, would tell its advocates very bluntly that theirs is "another Gospel which is not another," but a ruinous perversion of the truth. He would speak of some of the disastrous consequences which result from a denial of the resurrection. Of course he is out of date with the wiser theologians of this advanced age, yet it may be well to recall his vivid description of those consequences:—

"Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins."

But we have another school of renovators of "humanity" of whom a passing glance may be taken. These saviours of society will have nothing at all to do with the Gospel. Its miraculous and ethical elements are alike discarded with contempt. The whole thing is obsolete, out of date, well enough, perhaps, some few parts of it for "the world's childhood," but unfit for the intelligent manhood of an age of highly developed civilisation. In fact the Bible is in the way of these friends of man. They cannot preach their "gospel"

Digitized by Google

so effectually as they would, because of the obstinate old Book, or of the obstinate people who are thick-headed enough to love its truths, and delight in its promises, and bask in the golden sunlight of its prospects, and trust and worship the SAVIOUR whom it reveals, and the GOD and FATHER whose ineffably attractive character is its unfading crown of glory.

Yes, the Book *is* in the way of that atheistic secularism which chills the human heart, makes men a race of miserable orphans destitute of a Divine Father's care, and turns the future into the blackness of darkness without a solitary star to point to the possibility of hope. Miserable delusion, terrible infatuation! Men improved, society regenerated, the world bettered by blotting out the light of revelation and ignoring the existence of the "living GOD!" But the Church is greatly to blame. She is shamefully at fault. Had she faithfully occupied the position assigned her by the Book, the position of a witness for her rejected Lord, waiting for his return, she too would have been "in the way" of the teachers of error, whether avowedly Christians or avowedly Christless. But she did not like to stand at the world's bar with her hand upon the book; she must take her seat upon the bench; she must be recognised among the judges and rulers; she must "develop" into hierarchical power; she must be clothed in purple and fine linen and fare sumptuously every day; *and so it came to pass!*

What came to pass? Why, all that we are witnessing to-day at the opening of this year of grace, eighteen hundred and seventy-eight, in the way of doctrinal discord, ecclesiastical confusion, sectarian rivalries, theatrical ritualism, hierarchical pomp and vanity, and infidel dogmas to supply the world with the light and help which the Church has failed to give it!

This is what came to pass! It is all perfectly logical. The conclusion accords with the premiss; the effect agrees with the cause; and there is not an aspect of the present state of the so-called religious world which was not foreseen and epitomised eighteen hundred years ago as foreshowing and foreshadowing the great apostasy, and the return of the Son of God to bring the new year of the coming age, when "the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, for the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously."

For apart from the assurances and promises of Scripture to that effect, both on moral and governmental grounds a new dispensation is absolutely required. The analogy of the past suggests it; the condition of the present points to it; and the honour of the supreme Ruler demands it. But we are not left to the guidance of mere logic in this momentously important matter. The sure word of prophecy sheds its welcome light on the future, and asks us to "sing with gladness" because of that which the Lord will do. The thing in all its beneficent greatness, and in all its details must be left to him. He will realise his purposes and accomplish his designs in



Digitized by Google

the restitution predicted by men who spoke as they were moved by his Spirit. We must not look to an arm of flesh in this case. Ecclesiastical parliaments may have their talk and organise their schemes, but it is beyond their power either to perfect the Church, which is the body of Christ, or to bring the world to a loyal recognition of its divinely appointed King. But whilst the realisation of the Divine purpose regarding both Church and world belongs to the Divine Purposer, the disciples of Christ should remember that they have a noble duty to discharge which cannot be neglected without disloyalty to their Master and detriment to mankind. They are neither appointed nor expected to convert the world, but they are appointed and expected to be its salt and light. It is their high privilege to preserve it from utter corruption — the office of salt; and to show it the truth—the office of light. In a word, they are witnesses, and in proportion to the honesty and fidelity of their testimony will be their reward hereafter, if not their success in convincing others now. All true witnesses, who are penetrated with a sense of the unspeakable importance of their testimony, eagerly and prayerfully long for proof of its acceptance by the multitude around them; but they are not to be discouraged though ridiculed as "babblers" (Acts xvii. 18) or assailed as disturbers of the world's peace (ver. 6); for the verdict of the Lord when he returns will not be, "Well done, good and *successful*," but "Well done, good and *faithful* servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." ED.

---

## MANY AND FEW STRIPES.

"Rightly dividing the Word of Truth."—2 TIM. ii. 15.

I. AS the divinely promised infliction of many and few stripes has been introduced into the question of the *ultimate doom of the unsaved*, and as I believe that the Scriptures afford no warrant for such addition to *their* final sentence, I desire, under grace, to point out the period when, the persons on whom, and the cause wherefor these "stripes" are said to be inflicted.

II. Luke xii. 35-48 is an unbroken narrative of certain acts that will be performed by the Lord Jesus in his judicial capacity as Son of Man (John v. 27) at the time of his personal return from heaven to earth, such acts being awards, remunerative as well as denunciatory of certain "servants." The judicial element in these acts is the first of a series of which mention is made in 2 Tim. iv. 1, where it is said that "the Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing and his kingdom*." "At his appearing" then it is that he will bring reward to the "men who will have waited for their Lord" with girded loins (zealous in

Digitized by Google

service), and lighted lamps of testimony (vers. 36, 37); whilst at the same time he will proceed to arraign others, having only an outward profession of servants, for their unfaithfulness and for their wicked alliance with the Antichristian powers * in the persecution of their fellows (ver. 45). I say "Antichristian," because that will be the state of the world at the Advent of the Lord as the avenging Mediator. (Rev. xvii. 14, and xix. 11 to the end, must here be read.) It will moreover be observed that verses 1-16 of Rev. xix. precisely correspond with ver. 36 of Luke xii., which says that the return of the Lord to the earth † will be *after a wedding in heaven*, to "the marriage supper" of which Rev. xix. 1, 7-9, evidently refers, as to an event immediately preceding his advent, ver. 11, &c. Thus much for the period of time alluded to in Luke xii.

III. Let us now consider who these servants are, some of whom are rewarded, and others punished. That this word "servants" is a peculiar characteristic of Israel, nationally, may be learnt from their entire history. The nation was not only called to a special service of attractive testimony when first located in their land flowing with milk and honey, a centre of a circle of idolatrous nations (Deut. xxxii. 8); but are further looked upon as servants of Jehovah Jesus, in view of the ministry in which they will be engaged when "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation," during the millennial reign, to publish peace and salvation to "all the ends of the earth." (Isa. lii. 7-10.) Thus perfecting in regeneration a service in which they failed as men in the flesh only. Let Rev. vii. 2-17 be referred to, where Israel is seen as nationally sealed unto future service, and designated "servants of God," ver. 3; in close sequence to which is recorded a multitude of "nations and people, and tongues," *under the same seal*, forerevealed in a saved condition as the result of Israel's ministry, of whom it is said "Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit." (Isa. xxvii. 6.) The church, on the contrary, is not spoken of as a corporate body of servants, howbeit as members of the body of Christ they are in the place of testimony. The apostles, as Jews, called themselves servants, but at the hour when the Lord would take his disciples into his confidence as the nucleus of his future Church, he said to them: "Henceforth I call you *not servants*, but *friends*, for the servant knoweth not what his Lord doeth." The "servants" therefore of Luke xii. may be safely considered to be Israelites.

IV. As there can be no question but that "the marriage supper" in heaven is that of the church, the present bride and future wife of the Lamb, the Christ of God (Rev. xix. 1–9; Ephes. v. 25-27); moreover, that, when married above, Christ and his wife (members

* Compare Rev. xi. 15-18.

† "*To the earth*," because of a previous descent "into the firmament." (1 Thess. iv. 17.)

Digitized by Google

of his body) will return to earth together (Rev. xix. 14; Col. iii. 4); there can be as little difficulty in understanding, after what has been said § III., that it is exclusively to the Jews of the latter days that the narrative of Luke xii. refers.

V. Rev. xiv. 1-4 brings to notice a body of Israelites of those days of the Antichrist, who will have been found faithful even amidst the fires of a licentious idolatry, a remnant, as it were, severed from those their fellows whose tyrannising persecutions they will have endured for refusing complicity with the blasphemous orgies of the Antichristian wild beast in daring defiance of the God of heaven. (Dan. xi. 29-36, with Rev. xiii.) These faithful few will be partakers sf the reward promised in Luke xii. 36-38, which is anticipated in Rev. xiv. But their guilty oppressors, not giving heed to the testimony of the two witnesses of those days (Jude 14-16), will not be expecting the return of the Son of Man to execute vengeance on such flagrant wickedness: yet He will come, when they, with the rest of an infatuated world, shall be crying "peace and safety," and with sudden destruction shall "cut in sunder" many such deluded sinners, whose portion shall be with unbelieving Gentiles who have not retained God in their knowledge, but who will worship the creature rather than the Creator. (Luke xii. 45, 46; 1 Thess. v. 1-3; Rom. i.) These Jews will be utterly excised from the kingdom of the Messiah; having boasted in the law, through breaking the law will have dishonoured God, and caused his name to be blasphemed among the Gentiles, thus giving proof of their being merely Jews outwardly, uncircumcised in heart, servants only by imposture. (Rom. ii. 17-29.)

VI. But besides these there will be, as the Evangelist says, others not so utterly abandoned, who will undergo more or less chastisement according to their service in those things committed to them (Luke xii. 48), ere they be admitted to participate in the blessings of a restored Israel in the promised land during the age of the Kingdom; *for there is no mention made of their excision therefrom.* With these Scriptures before me, I am of opinion that the above mentioned parties are the "servants" who will pass under the "eyes of fire" of the Lord Jesus Christ "at his appearing" for the judicial adminstration of his kingdom, who will severally receive either reward, utter rejection, or many and few stripes, "according to their deeds." Of what those stripes consist, he who is judge of all the earth alone knows; man therefore is prohibited from giving an opinion.

VII. Further,—I am aware of the passages that foretell a "much sorer punishment" (Heb. x. 28-31), a "greater condemnation," &c., the former of which records the most flagrant sins possible, yet are they such as will characterise the world of blasphemous and impious defiers of God and the Lamb during the "perilous days" previous to the Advent of the Son of Man to grind his ene-

Digitized by Google

mies to powder. (Luke xx. 17, 18; Psa. cx. 1.) Days in which the thunders of Sinai will again be heard in more than their wonted terrors, for legal retribution will overtake those sinners, a "sorer punishment" than the law of Moses inflicted, a tribulation of which it is said "such was not since the beginning of the world, nor ever shall be." (Matt. xxiv. 21, 22, with Rev. ix. 5, 6.) A punishment described in the successive vials of wrath of Rev. xvi., limited however, "for the elect's sake," (faithful servants,) or no flesh could survive. (Matt. xxiv. 22.)

Mr. White says,*—writing I believe under the impression that the stripes are inflictions more or less prolonged previous to the final extinction of the wicked:—"Why should it be thought incredible that Almighty God should punish daring offenders by tribulation and anguish," and he adds, "that in doing so, he will only as judge of all the earth *do right*." Undoubtedly he will; but the question still remains as to whether such men as are typified in the language of Matt. xxiii. and Rom. ii. 8, will not come under the above-mentioned greater judgments at that period when "the wrath of God shall be *filled up*," and poured out on an ungodly, lawless, and devil-idolising world, *the dawn* of THE DAY of judgment. (Rev. xv. 1.) Mr. Minton † writes under the same impression with reference to "the sufferings which accompany the final death of the wicked," that "it will not be a simple act of annihilation, but a process of destruction, the fire of God's wrath will not consume at once, but they will be tormented for the 'ages of ages' that they have yet to live." With all deference to so able a writer in this righteous cause, we cannot but think such expressions likely to prove a hindrance to inquirers, since most writers on the subject have laboured to prove that everlasting punishment and destruction is *not a process* of punish*ing* or *destroying*, but one act of extinction the *effect* of which is without end; after the same manner that "one sacrifice for sins" "one offering of the body of Jesus Christ" perfects "*for ever*" the redemption of men. No one has declared this more emphatically than Mr. White in his work above quoted, pp. 426, 427. Let it be also remembered that, in the cases where final destruction is the irrevocable sentence, a just God will assuredly execute the judgment to the uttermost, yet as to the mode of execution, "his mercy endureth for ever."‡

H. GOODWYN.

---

* "Life in Christ." † "The Glory of Christ."

‡ With regard to the several passages in the Book of Revelation where torment is mentioned, such as ch. xiv. 10, xx. 10, I have endeavoured, in my lately issued work on that Book, to show that of the Devil only is it true that torment is inflicted, and that for a limited period.

In chapter xx. 10, there is no reason for doubting that the italicised word "*are*" should be "*were*."

In chapter ix. 5, the punishment is on earth during the Antichristian days. See my chapter 8, pp. 255, 256, and chapter 11, pp. 316-319.

Digitized by Google

# THE ARGUMENTUM AD HOMINEM.

ONE of the marvellous attributes of the Bible—some would say its most authoritative attribute—is the copious provision with which it meets every aspect of many-sided humanity. Designed for the use and behoof of man, how indeed could it be otherwise? Whether the object be to condemn, to fascinate, or to attract him, man discovers as by an electric shock that he has found his match; and under the influence of this conviction he is not long in making the further discovery that acquiescence must take the form of absolute surrender; but that reluctance to acquiesce, be it more or less pronounced, may be preserved and nursed by resorting to ignominious flight;—a still better figure of speech would perhaps be, "by the process of shutting the eyes." This absolute surrender, on the one hand, is the divinely appointed method for sublimating humanity into a quenchless ardour for immortality. The perfidy of flight, on the other hand, leaves him, alas, subject to death. The ignoble influence prompting to the latter alternative is nevertheless part and parcel of the humanity addressed: and herein, we are assured, is found its great condemnation,—a condemnation resting not, as the Apostle Paul so distinctly affirms, on the imputation of sin, for, says he, "God is not imputing their trespasses unto men;" but on voluntary oblivion of the Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. And what is this Light but that God is Love? The imputation of sin can be borne with far greater complacency than this dazzling effulgency. What human eye or heart could be subjected to its concentrated blaze without instant combustion? Well is it for us that it reaches us through the comparatively dense temperature of human affections, human hopes and fears, and ofttimes of human despair. How the keen-visioned angels sustain it, is faintly revealed by the figure which likens their own ministry to a flame of fire. Some few of human mould have seemed to be set on fire too; but the contagion which they scattered had but a limited range. Its radiation was straightway quenched in the languid neutrality which furnished sepulchres for the prophets, but shrouded itself in an "eclipse of faith." It was not intended apparently that all or any even of the most gifted specimens of the race should become heroes of seraphic stature until they had first tested in the school of humanity the utmost limits of their actual inheritance,—a school of sharpest discipline and drastic search. This was indeed to pass through the valley of humiliation, "a place," as John Bunyan says, "altogether without honour." It was not only to profess with the Roman moralist "Nothing that is human is alien from me," but to be tempted and tried in all points like unto their brethren. To give this experiment a fair trial, One at last appeared, equipped wtih a mission which none of his predecessors could fulfil, to bear this form of witness to the

Digitized by Google

truth to the very uttermost, and thus by being made perfect through sufferings, to become the author of eternal life to his followers. The lowliness of the station thus chosen as the fittest platform from which to herald forth the love of the Father may well be accepted as a source of confidence by all true-hearted missionaries of later ages. As "the Son of Man" simply, he made his constant address to his auditors as men; and the entire series of colloquies recorded in John's Gospel exhibit him as appealing to the normal love of life quite independent of the artificial accessories of temporal prosperity. He did not stop to prove that conscious life, wherever discoverable, was designed by its gracious Author as the channel and the expression of happiness. This was accepted as self-apparent; and the apostle Paul adopted the same *argumentum ad hominem* when he invited the Athenians to expect from the hand which gave them rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, the sublimer behest of a Resurrection. Men's intuitions then must be apprehended and touched; and though Paul's practice of becoming all things to all men was an admission that consciences are variously coloured and modified by education, he yet plainly intimated that all men are equally assailable on some given points. In other words, he regarded some truths as carrying with them an imperial authority which rendered them absolutely irresistible. When once accepted, they could never be upset.

One of Paul's fundamental assertions had reference to the Lord's Resurrection, the historical and popular proof of which event would rest upon a basis which we do not now possess. In that era of the Church's history, he could appeal to the concurrent testimony of hundreds of living witnesses. But we are not thereby chained down to the necessity of supposing that he had no other argumentative weapons in store,—no divine methods of reasoning on the Resurrection which might be as necessary and available in a cynical Areopagus as in a modern school of philosophers. When Life was his theme, we refuse to believe that "his bodily presence was weak, or his speech contemptible" as some fastidious Corinthians deemed; and while he pictured the hostile results of sowing to the Spirit and sowing to the flesh as inevitably tending either to life or death, can we doubt that every listening heart, whether Jew or Greek, stood transfixed with conviction? He exhibited too in his own personal career a form of proof both to ancients and moderns which cannot be too highly appreciated. He showed what belief in the Resurrection-Life could make of a man. Shall we be wrong in saying that it fashioned him into an absolutely faultless model? Well, let us hear his own testimony on this point. Far from adopting the mock-modesty of popular philanthropists, who are for ever lamenting, when they are praised, that their services though honestly rendered have been very imperfect, he fearlessly says in effect, and that on very many occasions, "I have not only endeavoured to realise and fulfil this new Life, but I have done it well,

Digitized by Google

I have done it thoroughly; and no man shall stop my boasting." Quotations in fact crowd upon us.—"I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day,"—"I know nothing against myself" [Alford's version],—"I beseech you, brethren, be ye imitators of me,"—"We recommend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God,"—"In holiness and sincerity, not in fleshly wisdom but in the grace of God, we had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly towards you,"—"We are unto God a sweet savour of Christ,"—"Ye know how holily and unblamably we lived among you,"—"We have made ourselves an example unto you to imitate us,"—"Brethren, be ye followers together of me,"—"The things which ye learned, and received, and heard, and saw in me, do."—Or take his entire address to the presbyters at Ephesus, and lastly his dying song, "I have fought the good fight, I have kept the faith." Who can read such outspoken declarations as these without a sense of thankfulness that one life at least stands out an unequivocal testimony to the end of time of the transforming power of faith in the Resurrection.

Will it be said,—"This personal experience of Paul may be a proof presented to the eye of the Church, but is no proof as addressed to the world?" Nay, it is a form of the Argumentum ad hominem which simple hearts will gratefully cherish,—which wilful hearts cannot altogether ignore. Strictly speaking, we admit, the Argumentum ad hominem supposes that sort of appeal which will elicit the same response from all men at all times and places; but the term is practically accepted by logicians as applicable also to an appeal which is made to any man in the condition in which it finds him. Now these conditions vary; and this will explain why the Apostle Peter in his first sermon on the day of Pentecost offered pardon rather than life to his countrymen. He knew that he was addressing a self-righteous people who arrogated to themselves as the favourites of Heaven that exceptional holiness which had first of all to be stripped off before his message could be accepted, as indeed it is very shortly afterwards termed, as "all the words of this life." And the reason why St. Paul dwelt on the resurrection of the body when debating with the intellectual Athenians, was because he knew, and they knew also, that their philosophic theses attributing to the spirit of man the faculty of occupying a position independent of the body's clog, and of soaring at last into a condition of blissful isolation, not unfrequently issued in a recoil towards a still more debasing sensualism. Nor, lastly, was it unreasonable in the Apostle to regard the experimental test as to what the true faith could accomplish, and had accomplished in himself, as a fair and logical piece of evidence. It is felt to the present hour to carry irresistible force to every honest student of human nature.

Let it be admitted then that, in view of every mental condition, the Bible finds men out. Still, the most forceful form of appeal

Digitized by Google

must be that which touches men in some vital point common to all. He who knew what was in man could not err when directing this shaft; nor can there be a doubt that the most illustrious example of the argumentum ad hominem to be found in sacred or profane literature exists in the familiar expostulations which were addressed to the listening Jews on the value of life. That life which was justly regarded by his auditors as so dear that a world would weigh nothing in the balance against it, was but a temporary possession after all; yet temporary and fugitive as it was, its cordial surrender would secure its immortality, while its selfish retention could but issue in its ultimate destruction. This came home to every heart; and many besides the apostles were prompt to respond,—Thou hast the words of eternal life.

The general law that life (conscious life, that is; not the life of plants and minerals) is the ordained channel of happiness to God's creatures, though instinctively apprehended by the simple men and women of Judea, seems strangely forgotten by many of their learned successors; yet surely the eloquent activities of all animated nature are ready to articulate the happy thought. Beginning with the manifestation of animal life in its most initial form, with the mere protoplasm adhering to the primæval rock, where the transition from the vegetable to the animal kingdom seems hardly discernible, and following it up through every successive stage of development, through molluscous, reptilian, and mammalian gradations, till we reach the platform of man, who will deny that the actions of the animals as a general rule are indicative either of the enjoyment or of the pursuit of happiness? The necessities of the predatory kinds may seem to create exceptions, but they are very small breaks in the general joy; and Livingstone has told us how mercifully the victims are delivered from fear by the fascination of their destroyers. Having then risen to the genus Homo, whose organisation being more complicated and elaborate is therefore the most susceptible of pleasure and pain, we shall be asked, Are man's actions always indicative of happiness? Let Livingstone again speak. He tells us of tribes in the centre of Africa who, when at peace among themselves and living out of the reach of Portuguese slave-hunters, were manifestly in the enjoyment of Arcadian bliss. All that it is necessary to establish at least is this, that they preferred life to death. Now, we advance a step higher, to the people who, knowing right from wrong, are described by Job as saying to God, Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways. Nevertheless, every thing was prosperous around them; they had more than heart could wish; they spent their days in wealth, and in a moment went down to the repose of hades [*anapausis adou*]. Here, again, earthly existence is identified with happiness. The ultimate destiny of these people enters not into the present question. To those who have thus had opportunities of draining the full cup of earthly delights, "the woman of Samaria," in New Testament story, may

Digitized by Google

offer a typical resemblance. To them as to her the message comes, "This voluptuous life of yours has its charms, but it is not worthy to be compared with the life which I bestow. Judge by the fruits and flowers which you have already gathered what it must be to inherit the paradise of God." Passing from the rejectors of God in high places to the votaries of vulgar vice, the appeal based on a love of life has still a voice, drowned ofttimes though it be in misery and revelry, and still oftener robbed of its essential force by ignorance as to the objects most worthy of pursuit even in the present state. In the degradation thus engendered man seldom sues for any relief but in that which brings a temporary refuge from ennui, temporary frivolity, or temporary oblivion. Would it then be safe to assert that, the higher the moral status he can be induced to reach in this world, the more susceptible he will become to the logic pervading the Gospel of St. John? Nay, it might be heresy to say this; for is it not written, "The poor have the Gospel preached unto them?" The Gospel then must be something appreciable by all alike; and with its vital simplicity, as set forth by its Divine Author, let us contrast for a moment the formula it is ofttimes made to present towards the poor and downtrodden. We will suppose, for instance, that the auditory consists of a group of savages, or say, of comparatively intelligent Hindoos.

"You are all of you," says the modern teacher, "endowed with the power of an endless life,—with the inalienable inheritance of immortality,—an appalling and overwhelming condition perhaps you think, and rightly too. But this is not all; for I have further to declare that this immortality of yours is impregnated, stained, and dyed with an element termed sin, the effect of which is to render it a condition of ceaseless misery to yourselves, and of alienation from the Author of your being. This poisonous element moreover is ineradicable by any native effort of your own, and can be eliminated only by the healing process of faith in a Divine Saviour, whose mission I now proceed to unfold."

Would this statement commend itself to human instincts, or would it not? It is a question of such terrible import as almost to stifle utterance. Yet if it should turn out to be really in defiant antagonism to the New Testament record,—the mystery hidden for ages, but now heralded to a dying world, who can keep silence?

ASPIRATOR.

Digitized by Google

# THE FALL,—ITS OBJECT AND RESULT.

## NOTES OF AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT HAGLEY ROAD MEETING HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM, OCT. 14th, 1877.

"Moreover the law entered that the offence might abound, but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."—ROM. v. 20, 21.

THE text may serve as an index to the line of thought that will follow.

We have to consider, first, the *Creator* and the *creature*. The Creator perfectly blessed on account of a perfect character. The creature capable of like blessedness through growth into the same character. But such growth is impossible without the profoundest love. How, then, shall love be awakened in the creature of sufficient depth and potency to make it grow into the likeness of its Maker? and how shall the moral likeness of the Creator be fully made known?

Will the simple conference of creature blessings do it—sustenance—enjoyment—good of this life in profusion? It is more than doubtful. Gratitude and admiration form the vertebræ of love. Gratitude is a weak principle in the happy, and the heaping up of favours upon those who have no sense of ill-desert begets indifference, complaining, and ingratitude. It is deliverance from evil and the consciousness that while good is received, evil is your due,—these beget gratitude in its warmest, truest type. The child, punished, repentant, forgiven—the whipped hound—the pardoned rebel. These are devoted followers. To save from death is to establish a unique claim upon a fellow-creature, seldom unacknowledged. When the Highest stoops to save the lowest, and the lowest knows it has offended,—then the claim becomes all-powerful.

Due admiration of the character of God cannot be evoked without a full disclosure being made of its glories.

The experience of evil by the creature—the action of God towards an evil creature—these became necessary to the begetting of a love powerful enough to constrain obedience, and fired by admiration of the infinite worthiness of the God obeyed.

Hence the Fall,—the necessary prelude to the redemption and advancement of the race. The only means, so far as we can see, whereby man could know God in the supreme excellence of his character, and be placed under a debt of gratitude immeasurably greater than would accrue from creation and preservation solely.

How precious is this motive power of gratitude let us consider. God's will is the fountain of law.—God being perfectly righteous, his will, obeyed, must conduce to the highest happiness of the creature.—To obey it is salvation.—But without a love unique and incommunicable such obedience is impossible.

Digitized by Google

We see, then, that for the production of such a love there must be forgiveness and deliverance from evil, and for these the introduction of sin, and for the introduction of sin the promulgation of law. Hence Adam, Eden, and the Fall. Here we meet with our text: "The law entered that the offence might abound." Why? Because it is the necessary prelude to the exercise of grace, which grace reconciles the creature to its God, revealing the Divine Father and winning the human son. The very first step preparatory to a work of grace was to bring in the whole world guilty before God.

A parent will never win the affection of his children, who does not establish rules for his household, and punish or forgive under their regime. Moral precepts imposed upon a moral being become obligatory by their own light, but an additional obligation attaches to them from the fact that the will of the Creator must be the fountain of law to the creature. Arbitrary commands, not in themselves moral, are binding when given by the Creator to the creature. Hence guiltiness may be brought about either by the breach of moral precepts, or of commands respecting things morally indifferent. Accordingly we have the Decalogue and the Ceremonial Law. If the feeble moral development of the Law in an individual led him to think he had escaped the former, he was easily caught in the meshes of the latter, which were more gross and palpable to him, and not more arbitrary than the reservation in Eden. If he failed to perceive that he really had more gods than one—that he worshipped self as well as Jehovah; he could not escape the conviction that he had eaten a forbidden meat. Hence the most blunt in spiritual perception, and the most ignorantly self-righteous were constantly compelled to bring sacrifices for sin, and thus acknowledge the need of forgiveness, or, in other words, their entire dependence upon the grace of God, without which experience the soul's salvation is for ever impossible.

Let us pause for a moment to consider this point. Salvation, we say is impossible to the creature who does not need forgiveness. If law could be absolutely obeyed it could not lead to life eternal, for the creature would be grounded in self-righteousness, i.e., in independence of the Creator's grace. Such a posture of soul prohibits it from drinking of the river of life. We believe there is not an angel in heaven whose position is not due to grace.

Think of this *forgiveness*. It is the one thing towards which man can do nothing of himself. He earns his bread, and he cannot separate himself as conducing to the result. It is God helping self. He obeys the laws of health. Here again self moves with God and destroys the feeling of absolute dependence. (We speak, of course, of those who cannot run back down the chain of second causes till they find it linked to God's throne.) But *forgiveness!* Here man is absolutely helpless without God—the entire thing proceeds from God—from its very nature the creature can contribute nothing towards it—and upon receiving it his indebtedness becomes absolute.

Digitized by Google

Hence a law which man could obey could never lead to life; but a law which, entering, causes *the offence to abound*, is ordained unto life, because it is a schoolmaster bringing us to Christ.

John Foster stood in amaze at the Levitical economy, but to us it appears a clearly essential factor in involving the whole Jewish nation in acknowledged guilt, which is the first step to a real righteousness. Better of course be incriminated under the moral law, which all enlightened Jews felt themselves to be; but, failing that, incrimination under the ceremonial law is a helpful step towards the creature's spiritual education.

Now consider again,—Law, as here understood, clearly fails of its end when it does not bring its subjects in guilty. Hence law must continually advance with the advancement of the creature. When the Jewish nation thought they were fulfilling the ceremonial law, the prophets thundered against them for breaches of the moral code. When in their blindness they could scarcely be convinced of breaches of the Decalogue, they were accused of mingling the broth of abominable things with their sacrifices.

Christ's forerunner came preaching the *baptism of repentance*. His work was to bring all in guilty,—preparatory to the proclamation of *forgiveness* for all. Mark how in answer to the inquiry, "What shall we do?" John the Baptist confines himself in reply to just that precept which in their several cases was sure to make them retire self-condemned. When Christ commenced his ministry of reconciliation, he did so by preaching a sermon which threw the most anxious observer of the Law completely off his pinacle of confidence and left him, as it were, wallowing in the mire. The time had come to lift the law higher, so that none might escape. Let there be no mistake. The Law in itself, as coming from God, must always be holy, just, and good; but the spirit of obedience to it can never be begotten, until we have felt brought under its condemnation. Like certain crystals, we cannot know its beauty till we have broken it. But no sooner are we forgiven under it, than we can live without it, rejoicing in the glorious liberty of the children of God, upon whose hearts God himself writes laws continually ascending in their rigour and severity.

There are some Christians who talk of perfection. But he who talks of *perfection* must conceive of God's law as a definite quantity of observable precepts, and as he thinks himself approaching towards it, he is in reality going back to childhood, if not to perdition. Righteousness never was and never can be by the Law; its ministry is to convince of sin and thus prepare a way for salvation. It is the schoolmaster, the grand instrument for the spiritual education of the human race. The hunter in the riding school has the bar placed higher and higher, always in order that he may leap it. But man in God's school has the moral bar placed higher and higher, not that he may leap it, but that, confessing his failure, *God may lift him over.*

Digitized by Google

We know that the summary of the Law given by our Saviour and by St. Paul covers the whole ground of possible duty for man, but to bring home guilt, particulars are necessary, and if we were so dull of perception as not to discover in the Sermon on the Mount that which ministered condemnation, it would be necessary for Christ to come from heaven to preach another sermon, exalting and defining his requirements in such a way as to exclude all boasting and bring in every soul guilty before God. See how the Saviour dealt with the rich young man who came addressing him thus: "*Good* master, what *good* thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" Jesus perceived at once that he was wanting in the first requisite for salvation, and therefore replies in such a way as to meet his case. "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God." Then, when this young man professed to have kept the commandments enumerated, and even to have loved his neighbour as himself, Christ does not stay to parley with him and expose his rank infatuation, but hastens to promulgate a new commandment under which the inquirer was certain to fall self-convicted of disobedience. "Sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me."

Because the young man went away sorrowful, it is commonly supposed that he departed from the interview farther from the kingdom than he was before; but without doubt he made his first step towards heaven when he received into his soul the conviction that at least one obligation condemned him as a sinner. The command given him was definite and attainable, as easily comprehended as abstinence from things strangled, and failure was consequently inexcusable; hence the Master's comment: "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God." But as a beginning, opening his eyes to the fact that God's commandments are "exceeding broad," and that he talked like a dreamer when he said: "All these things have I kept from my youth up" —this episode in his career was eminently serviceable. Who knows after what he sorrowed, or what he felt himself bound to part with, —riches or eternal life? He may have gone straight to an auctioneer!

The key to the Epistle to the Romans is this exposition of the guilt of the world, through the introduction of Law and sin reigning in order that grace might reign over it. The Gentile is brought in guilty with the Jew, and the Jew with the Gentile; but what is the reiterated conclusion of the whole matter? It is briefly expressed in the words of our text: "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Or, more emphatically, "He hath concluded all under sin in order that he might have mercy upon all." But mark! there is no making void the Law, nay rather the Law is

Digitized by Google

established, for "grace reigns unto eternal life, *through righteousness*," and through righteousness only.

The whole process is designed for the creation of righteous creatures.

But the breach of law is righteousness perceived, for then only is sin made to appear exceeding sinful. By forgiveness of the breach is love begotten, and by love the longing for obedience, and by such tearful obedience the righteousness of faith—the righteousness of God. Such is the process. Something like it is seen in the manufacture of steel, where the object being the finest kind of iron, it requires to be charged first of all with impurities by which it is tempered to its final state; or in the hundred and one manufactures where the raw material is in the first instance broken up and apparently destroyed, only to issue from the last machine the beautiful and finished product, a delight to the eye and a beauty to the world.

The law is not made void, we said; God forbid, for how does the forgiveness come, but through him the second Adam who knew no sin, through whose righteousness alone there is mercy for the sinner. To the inherent excellence of the law there is added the exceeding loveliness of the Lawgiver. Thus the attractive force becomes enormous, and man is redeemed unto holiness.

We have not spoken of physical law, but here again we find evil working good, Much as science has done to make us ware of evil consequences, we are as far off as ever from feeling independent of Almighty God, And should the day ever come when science shall have conquered every enemy but death, it would be necessary for God to establish new laws against which science had no remedy. For the greatest calamity that could befall the human race, is not famine, tempest, pestilence, or death, but that men should be able to say, "We can defy God, for we have found out his laws and can obey them, and escape their penalties." The whole reign of law both in the spiritual and physical spheres is designed to bring in man guilty and dependent upon God, in order that the contrite and lowly ones, the trustful and loving ones might hereafter enter into his exceeding joy.

But what then shall we say of sin and evil? Their reign is universal, will their issues be universal good?

One thing at all events we can see clearly, that their object and influence is educational. The world might have been alive without the Law, but it would be a poor and wretched, nay, a hideous life. The commandment has come, sin has revived, and the world has died. But when it died under penalty, it began to die unto sin. For sin reigned unto death preparatory to grace reigning through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

"The law has entered that the offence might abound;" the Gospel has entered, that grace might much more abound.

* HENRY DEACON.



Digitized by Google

# WHOSE ARE THE CURSES OF PSALM CIX.?

IN the RAINBOW for February last, I took leave to suggest that the imprecations of this Psalm (verses 6-19) were not those of David against one of his enemies, as is commonly understood, and as has been more than once assumed in some recent contributions to these pages, but of David's enemies against him, *quoted* by the psalmist in laying his plaint before the Most High. I wish now to make a brief statement of the grounds on which that suggestion was based, and why I deem it a preferable understanding to the one more usually taken. I may as well, perhaps, at this stage, state that it was to this "hint" as to the real source of these curses, and to this alone, that I referred when writing to the editor in the terms which he did me the honour to insert in the July number of his magazine; and I am sorry that Mr. Deacon should have so summarily dismissed its consideration, as I certainly think it merits, and will repay a careful examination.

Notwithstanding Mr. Deacon's incontinent rejection of the suggestion, I make bold to think that, looking in the first instance at its effect upon the meaning of the Psalm itself, not only is there nothing to prevent, but, on the contrary, much to recommend, and even demand, its acceptance. Whether there be any argument to the contrary in the words of Peter, recorded in Acts i., shall be presently considered. Meantime, I ask the reader's kind attention to the Psalm.

The most cursory examination of its structure shows it to be distinctly divided into three separate parts. The first section (verses 1-5, inclusive) contains the psalmist's humble and temperate appeal to God, for defence against the false and cruel words, and unfriendly acts of those who are stated to be his adversaries "without a cause." Suddenly, at ver. 6, begins a torrent of invective of the most terrible kind, which continues unabated to ver. 19; and is levelled throughout, it is very important to observe, against some *single individual.* Lastly, leaving out ver. 20 (of whose purport a word anon), at ver. 21 a return is made to the comparative calm of the opening section, and to the original attitude of an innocent and God-fearing man imploring Divine help to "save him from those that condemn his soul."

Now, on the assumption that the psalmist is from first to last uttering none but his own sentiments, some puzzling questions at once demand an answer. What means the sudden change from *they,* in section 1, to *he* and *him,* in section 2, and the equally marked return to the original number in section 3? Up to ver. 5, the psalmist's enemies are many, and they are all animated by the same hatred against him. "Why then," it has been well asked, "should he all at once pour the vials of wrath upon the head of one single individual, without either naming him or stating why he was

Digitized by Google

singled out from all other enemies equally hostile, and without even in any way characterising this foe?"

Again, how can we account for the equally strange and abrupt transition from the *mental attitude* of the psalmist in the opening verses to that of the middle section? He first makes mention of his ill-requited *love* to his foes, and professes (ver. 4) to betake himself to prayer, leaving his enemies, by strong contrast, to utter their cruel words against him; and then, if the frenzied curses are his which follow, immediately belies the attitude assumed, and gives us cause to wonder whether the "words of hatred," against which he appealed to heaven, could by any possibility exceed his own. But, to crown all, if the common supposition be correct, he has the assurance, with his lips still fresh and his heart still hot from the utterance of these terrible anathemas, to venture into the Divine presence with the words, "Let *them* curse, but bless thou!" Truly, it must require no little explanation to rid us of the feeling that this man, no matter who he was, must have had a very imperfectly developed conscience indeed. No wonder this psalm, as thus applied, should be deemed a "most distressing and perplexing composition, which even the most loyal Christian cannot read without certain uncomfortable misgivings," and "which some Christians," as Mr. Hammond* affirms, of his own knowledge, "have expunged from the Bible of their private devotions."

The "misgivings" which it occasions are altogether apart from any theory as to the individuality of its author. But they are rather increased than diminished when the psalm, including the curses it contains, is attributed to David, "the sweet Psalmist of Israel," whose character, in spite of all its drawbacks, exhibits so many lofty virtues, and whose songs have through all the centuries so well expressed the pious confidence of the children of God. "Can this be the generous hero," asks Mr. Hammond, and many will echo the inquiry, "who twice spared the life of the enemy who was seeking his life? Can this be the man who congratulated himself that he had been saved from avenging himself and shedding Nabal's blood? the man who, when Shimei cursed, merely said, 'Let him curse;' the man who cried to God, 'Lo, *I* have sinned, and *I* have done wickedly; but these sheep, what have they done? Let thine hand, I pray thee, be against me and against my father's house?'"

Can these persistent denunciations of disaster—physical, moral, and *spiritual*—against an enemy, however evil; this extension of the curse even to his helpless widow and orphan children—can these dreadful wishes have been deliberately written down as a Divine song by the man of whom Mr. Deacon, with the sympathies of us all,

* See his "Apology for the Vindictive Psalm," in *Expositor* (Nov. 1875), to which, as before acknowledged, I am mainly indebted for the explanation I offer.



Digitized by Google

has said: "We found it easy to do justice to the glory and beauty of his heavenly inspiration, to his clear vision of Divine sanctions, to the massive proportions of his faith, to the humble duty with which he bore his anointing, to his whole-souled love of God, and tender sensitiveness to the blame of God" (RAINBOW p. 409)? If so, indeed, it must be a "perpetual heaviness of heart" to many sincere seekers after God, which the laborious explanations of commentators will fail to entirely remove. Problems and difficulties, doubtless, there will always be, to our present limited attainments, in a book so marvellous and transcendent in its history and purpose; and it is only the thoughtless man who will reject its Divine authority, because it may in some details baffle his efforts to understand it. Far better to wait patiently for light in God's own time. Yet I, for one, am prepared, even now, to welcome any *reasonable* solution that will tend to diminish the number or the apparent magnitude of these problems. It is because the suggestion I make as to this 109th Psalm seems to me so very reasonable, and at once removes it entirely from the realm of the "mysterious" and "perplexing," where otherwise it holds a foremost place, that I venture to call attention to it.

The suggestion, then, is that at the beginning of ver. 6 we should understand some such word as "saying," to indicate that the curses which follow are quoted from the lips of the Psalmist's adversaries. I need scarcely point out that nothing is more common in the Old Testament than for words to be quoted, sometimes at considerable length, without any sign being given in the original that they are a quotation. I may refer to the following, out of a few examples instanced by Mr. Hammond, in which our common version has *supplied*, in italics, the requisite sign which the original lacks, viz.: —Psalm. ii. 2; xxii. 7; xli. 8; lix. 7; cv. 15; Prov. i. 21; Isa. xviii. 2; Jer. xxxi. 3; xl. 5. Still more to the point are the following, in which our translators supplied no special indication of the change of speaker, the reader being left to the guidance of the general sense of the passage alone (just as I submit is done in Psa. cix.), viz., Psa. ii. 6: xiv. 4; xli. 5 (comp. ver. 8); xlvi. 10; lii. 6, 7; lxxxi. 6; lxxxix. 3; xci. 14.

Moreover, the psalmists frequently lay before God the *very words* of hatred with which they had been assailed by their foes. See, for example, Psa. xxii. 8; xli. 5, 8; lxxi. 11; lxxiii. 11, &c. The fact that the quotation in Psalm cix. extends through several verses is not of itself any objection to its being supposed an instance of the same kind.

This being so, let any one read the Psalm in the light of the suggestion now made, and mark the effect. It is not too much to say that the result is a removal of all the main difficulties involved in the common understanding. Instead of presenting puzzles in literary structure, the whole composition become a clear and harmonious whole, divided into three natural sections. The changes

Digitized by Google

of number in the pronouns are no longer incomprehensible,* but are just what would of necessity arise out of the change of speakers. Instead of the inconsistency of a man who, in one breath, complains of the cruel words of his enemies and professes to find a refuge in a pious and patient waiting upon God; in the next, himself utters curse upon curse of the most far-reaching and appalling nature; and again, in the next, resumes the injured tone of a man whom *others* were cursing, though they could scarcely in any case do more in that way than he had himself just uttered—we have a consistent mental attitude throughout, and the whole psalm becomes the prayer of an innocent and afflicted man, whose only, yet sufficient, refuge from the slanders and machinations of his foes is in his God, before whom he lays his case, and *the very words of his enemies*,—a prayer rising in the close to an outburst of thankful confidence in the enjoyment of that Divine protection which he entreated. The very phrases which formerly stumbled us most,—such as "Let *them* curse, but bless thou"—become evidences in support of the improved understanding. And finally, the psalm, instead of requiring laboured hypotheses to reconcile us to its presence among songs of inspiration, becomes a touching picture of what David was wont to do in times of trouble (see, for example, 1 Sam. xxx. 6), and an encouraging model for the distressed child of God in all ages.

So naturally does this explanation seem to be called for, that it forced itself upon the notice of so orthodox a commentator as Dr. Adam Clarke, in the very middle of an elaborate application of vers. 6-19, in the usual typical manner, to Judas Iscariot. For, when he comes to ver. 20, he says: "Is not this verse a *key* to all that preceded it? The original, fairly interpreted, will lead to a somewhat different meaning:—'This is the work of my adversaries before the Lord, and of those who speak evil against my soul,' or life. That is, all that is said from the 6th to the 20th verse consists of the evil words and imprecations of my enemies against my soul, labouring to set the Lord, by imprecations, against me, that their curses may take effect. This, which is a reasonable interpretation, *frees the whole psalm from every difficulty*."

This translation of the verse, he says, "the original will well bear, and several of the versions countenance." It will be observed that even our common version, if we leave out the interpolated italics, comes pretty near conveying a similar sense:—"This the reward of my adversaries from the Lord,"—i.e., the reward they wish *for me*. But Dr. Clarke's translation turns rather on the word which our version renders "reward," and which he has translated "work." And Mr. Hammond, who also refers to this point in corroboration

* The fact that a somewhat similar change of pronouns in Psa. xxxv. 7, 8 does not seem open to this explanation surely cannot prevent our acceptance of the explanation here—where it seems not only feasible, but urgently called for.

Digitized by Google

of his argument, has some remarks upon it so thoroughly to the purpose, that I take the liverty of quoting them. He says (Expositor, vol. ii., p. 341), "The Hebrew word which is here translated 'reward' . . is פעלה, which Gesenius ("Thesaurus," *s. v.*) says is the synonym for מעשה, "work," and which he renders into Latin by (1) *quæ quis facit, agit*, and (2) *merces laboris*. . . . In nine out of the eleven* passages cited by him it is translated in our version by '*work*' or '*labour*,' in one passage, '*wages*,' and in the remaining, which is the passage we are now discussing, "*reward*." The LXX. render it generally by ἔργον, once by πόνος, once by μόχθος, and once by μίσθος. They translate *this* passage, τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον τῶν ἐνδιαβαλλόντων με παρὰ Κυριου; while the Vulgate renders it, 'Hoc opus eorum qui detrahunt mihi apud Dominum.' The primary, the almost invariable, meaning consequently is 'work,' 'doing;' the secondary and remotely-derived meaning is 'wage for work.' Now, assign the word its primary and usual meaning here, the meaning which both the LXX. and the Vulgate assign it, and it is conclusive in favour of the interpretation here advocated."

Understood in this way, verse 20 becomes a remarkable corroboration of the theory which has been found to fit so aptly to the rest of the psalm—being, in fact, a *direct statement* that the psalmist has been, from the 6th verse, quoting the words of others, and these, the adversaries referred to in ver. 4.

Thus every thing in the psalm, considered by itself, seems to favour this solution. It only remains to ask whether there is any argument, derivable from Peter's quotation of a part of verse 8 as applicable to Judas (Acts i. 20), sufficient to overthrow the very strong *primâ facie* evidence thus found.

The only reason which Mr. Deacon gives—but which he regards as "sufficient"—(p. 417) for his summary rejection of my suggestion is that "the last clause of ver. 8 is quoted as a word of inspiration concerning Judas," and cannot therefore be "the language of Christ's enemies concerning Christ." But why Mr. Deacon should seek to shelter himself behind this plea is to me incomprehensible. The shelter does not exist for him—for he has blown it up himself. On p. 416 he expressly declared that the psalm (including, of course, ver. 8) "cannot possibly be prophetic of God's judgments upon Christ's enemies," because "simply a prayer of David to God." To which of the two positions does he adhere? Surely he cannot to both. If he believes that Peter was correct in applying the phrase quoted as "a *word of inspiration concerning Judas*," it is surely equivalent to making the words "*prophetic* of God's judgments on *Christ's enemies*." If, on the contrary, he strictly stands by his statement on page 416, then, on his own admission, Peter quoted words as

* Viz., Prov. x. 16; xi. 18; Psa. xvii. 4; xxviii. 5; Isa. xl. 10; xlix. 4; lxi. 8; lxv. 7; Jer. xxxi. 16; Lev. xix. 13.

Digitized by Google

"concerning Judas" which originally had no such intended application—or, in other words, quoted them as *a free adaptation*, which cannot surely be intended to affect the sense of the context of the original psalm, to the extent of turning it upside down. Mr. Deacon may perhaps have some explanation to offer which may bring his two statements into more harmony than they seem presently to bear to each other. Meantime, I offer a word or two on the quotation itself to which he refers.

There is, doubtless, a very common idea among Christian expositors and commentators, that Peter's words are a warrant for the usual understanding as to the curses of this psalm, viz., that David, as a type of Christ, denounced the judgments which would fall upon the head of Christ's arch-enemy—Judas, the son of perdition; or, as the old-fashioned heading of many of our English Bibles has it, "David, complaining of his slanderous enemies, under the person of Judas, devoteth them." It is not to be denied that, at first sight, Peter's words do seem to countenance the idea; but I think that a more careful examination of the passage will show that—like some others which have been made to do yeoman's service in support of traditional errors—it has been strained beyond its legitimate application.

I think the mistake, as I deem it, in the reading of the speech of the apostle is mainly owing to two misconceptions.

1. It is assumed that it was to the quotations from the Book of Psalms, which he makes in ver. 20, that he referred in ver. 16, when he said: "*This Scripture* must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David, spake before concerning Judas." But it by no means is certain that Peter intended to establish such a connection. It is very singular that the marginal references given in our Bible seem to do more than sustain this doubt. None of them seem to point to Psalm cix. as "this Scripture," but almost all to Psa. xli. 9, a passage which is unmistakably quoted by our Lord, *in the hearing of the twelve*, as applicable to Judas. (John xiii. 18.) The idea that Peter referred to some passage of this kind—*the words* of which he did *not* quote—is further corroborated by the reading of the revised text of Bagster's Critical English New Testament. According to that text, we should read, not "this," but (rather more indefinitely) "the Scripture;" ταυτην being "omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, T. S. Green, Tregelles, ℵ, A, B, C., &c.; Vulgate, Coptic, Sahidic, &c." It remains to be proved therefore that there is any necessary connection between verses 16 and 20.

2. I think it is more probable that the words which Peter quotes as "written in the Book of Psalms" (ver. 20), were given merely as containing language *appropriate to his purpose*, just as we ourselves sometimes use the words of many writers, and of Scripture itself, without intending to force our temporary application of the language upon the *context* of the passage from which we quote. That the

Digitized by Google

Old Testament is sometimes thus quoted in the New is beyond a doubt. Paul, in Romans x. 18, quotes, as fulfilled in the *apostolic preaching*, words which, in the 19th Psalm, refer to the silent testimony to God's glory borne by *the heavenly bodies*. Are we therefore, because Paul so uses the 4th verse of that Psalm, to torture and twist the whole of that beautiful composition from its natural sense to make it fit into some fancied theory of typical fulfilment? I trow not.* So neither am I prepared to admit that, because Peter quotes from other psalms words as fulfilled in Judas Iscariot, therefore his quotation is to be taken as intended to upset the harmonious sense of the older Scripture.

But, besides, I think it is clear from the nature of his quotation that Peter was simply making such free adaptations as I suggest. "It is written in the Book of Psalms," says he, "Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein;" and "His bishopric let another take." Now the first of these quotations is altered from the original passage to suit the circumstances. It is apparently taken from psalm lxix. 25, but the pronoun is changed from plural to singular. Surely this is a free adaptation enough. This being so with the first part of the composite quotation, the second part, which is quoted from Psa. cix. 8, must of necessity be used in the same flexible manner. The two must stand or fall together. And hence the question, to whom the words were applicable in the orginal passages, can by no means be affected by such quotations.

With these remarks I must leave this question to the judgment of the readers of the RAINBOW. My desire is simply to aid the cause of Scripture inquiry and intelligent faith in the Word of God, which we all have at heart, and which are so much needed in these days of ours. I have no wish to indulge in "strictures," nor to pass any opinion whatever on the general theory of explanation of the imprecatory psalms, advanced by Mr. Deacon, who has, at least, been dealing courageously with a difficult problem. Yet I think our views of these Psalms, as a whole, are apt to be more largely coloured than we at first imagine, by the current reading of the 109th which I have been endeavouring to displace. But whatever "imprecations" may remain in other psalms to be explained, this I will say, that the correct explanation, whatever it be, will lose nothing, but may gain much, by the above most reasonable removal from the category of this psalm, which Mr. Deacon himself has called "the most fearful" of them all.

M. W. STRANG.

---

* Compare also 2 Cor. viii. 15 with Exod. xvi. 18.

Digitized by Google

# CHRISTIANITY IN SOLUTION.

WHEN a chemist has a crystallised mass of some particular salt or metal which by long exposure to the atmosphere has become partially deliquescent, or by violent contact with other bodies has had the angles of its crystals abraded or broken off, and he wishes to restore the amorphous mass to its pristine integrity and beauty of form, what does he do? He dissolves it, with or without the aid of heat, in the appropriate menstruum, and allows the solution to evaporate till the process of crystallisation again commences. Till this is the case, the salt or metal is said to be held '*in solution*.' Especially is this process resorted to if by any means some foreign substance has become embedded in the mass, which can only be removed by breaking it up; or, in the case of two salts having become intermingled the one adulterating the other, by the introduction into the solution of an acid having a much stronger affinity for the adulteration than for the substance which it is designed to purify.

Now this illustration, or shall we call it this parable of chemical science, seems to us not inaptly to represent the actual present condition of Christianity in these last years of the nineteenth century. Christianity so grievously corrupted and darkened for many centuries by heathen tradition, priestcraft, creed-making, text-mongering, illusion, and the always corrosive influences of the mind of the flesh upon Divine truth, has largely lost its original purity and beauty; its crystals, so to speak, both collectively and in particular, have ceased to present the sharpness of outline and geometric perfection of form which they ought to possess, while their facets, dull and blurred, no longer serve to reflect the light of the Eternal Love: like its predecessor Judaism it has "waxen old," and in the dissolving elements of modern thought, and by the heat of religious and scientific controversy it is fast becoming—in many minds has already become—*a solution;* a solution, howbeit, in which the keen acids of science and criticism are secretly but surely dividing the spurious from the genuine, the false from the true. In a word, what we see in a large measure already, and shall see still more clearly as time goes on, is *Christianity in solution.*

The substantial truthfulness of this representation of the present theological position, not only in England and Scotland, but throughout the civilised world, will hardly be called in question by any educated, well-informed, thoughtful Christian. It is freely acknowleged on every hand. We can hardly take up a book or a religious newspaper without finding some reference to the present transitional condition of religious belief.* The Christianity of the present is visibly breaking up before our eyes, and the question most anxiously asked is, What is to be *the*

* "The ultimate hope of the human spirit," writes PROFESSOR EDWARD CAIRD in the *Contemporary Review* for September, 1877, "must be to restore as reason what it then (i.e., at the era of the French Revolution) sought to destroy as the unreason of authority; to restore as the realisation of freedom what it then rejected as the bonds of an external necessity. This restoration involves, as has already been said, a thorough *re-formation* (in the etymological sense of the word) of the whole edifice of dogma and institution, in a way that few of the friends of religion have yet realised, a still fewer have had the faith and courage to attempt."

Digitized by Google

*Christianity of the future?* if that question does not indeed assume the darker form, *Is Christianity to have any future at all?* It is useless, much worse than useless, to ignore these facts; nor need we accept them with any feelings of apprehension or despondency; on the contrary, if the present is full of trouble the future is full of hope.

Let it never be forgotten, for it is a ground of immovable assurance and consolation, that *Christianity* is not CHRIST. Not very long before his death the lamented Dean Alford wrote as follows: "Christianity is one thing,—the Gospel, or the Christian revelation, is another. The Gospel, or the Christian revelation, is, as to its great truths, always the same. It has been given us once for all in the life and sayings of our Divine Master, and of those whom he specially authorised. It is the foundation. It is, in one word which includes all, Jesus Christ Himself: other foundation than whom none can lay. But *Christianity* is the building raised upon that foundation: and this may, and indeed must be, very variously constructed. Not only will it vary in worth of material and in power of endurance, according to St. Paul's well-known illustration; but it also will and must vary according to difference of times, climates, national temperaments and habits, classes and stations of men; nor less so according to the prevalence at this or that time of certain currents of thought and inquiry. Christ is one, and true, and unchangeable; but a man's Christianity, a family's Christianity, a nation's Christianity, the whole world's Christianity at any given time, may be inconsistent, and untrue, and liable to, and needing, change. By Christianity then I understand man's fashion of following Christ. And as each age and country has its own fashion, I shall presume to inquire whether our present fashion in this land is right; whether it is calculated to meet the demands which our age and our habits of thought are making upon us: and, in so far as we may think we find that it fails in these points, what change it needs in order to correct that failure, and enable it to hold its place as the Christianity of the future."

Recurring then to our illustration of solution, and seeing how rapidly, on the one hand, the dissolving process is going on, tradition after tradition, dogma after dogma, system after system crumbling away under its powerful influence; we may well be led, not without some solicitude, to inquire whether, on the other hand, there can be discerned in the still heated and agitated mass any indications of a new crystallisation of Divine truth; or whether the one process must be completed before the other can commence. In other words, as the Christianity of the past is disappearing, is the Christianity of the future being simultaneously revealed? or, must the former, like a seed, fall to the ground and die, before the latter can begin to grow?

For ourselves we are very confident that, under the Divine superintendence, it is in the former manner rather than the latter that this great transformation will be accomplished. God will not leave man, even for the briefest period, without some garment to cover his spiritual nakedness. Judaism was not dead when Christianity was born; the apostasy of Rome was not consummated when the light of the Reformation was kindled; and so in like manner the Christianity of the past shall not sink and disappear in the boiling sea of criticism and science before God has set our feet on a rock and established our goings.

Digitized by Google

Already, indeed, incipient and inchoate as the reconstructive process is, we think we can discern somewhat clearly the lines, or at least some of the lines, upon which the Christianity of the future will be built; and though the vision may seem to some only our own fond dream; though perchance we may mistake shadow for substance; though it may be after all only our hopes and wishes that seem prophetic; we will endeavour to point out what appear to us some of the elements of the Christianity of the future, in the hope that they may appear to others as reassuring as they do to ourselves.

I. In the first place, then, we believe that the Christianity of the future will be a Christianity of *facts and principles*, rather that of words and definitions. We have had in the past enough, and more than enough, of the anatomising of texts and the making of "articles of religion;" but the day of creeds, confessions, and catechisms is clearly drawing rapidly to its close, and when we see subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles relaxed in England, the revision of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms virtually decided on in Scotland, and even the Apostles' Creed—surely the most unobjectionable of such human compilations—objected to at Berlin; we may well take comfort in the fact that all that is really vital in Christianity is contained in its *facts* and *principles*, and not in any human theories we may construct and believe in reference to those facts, or as embodying those principles. Christians are learning, and must learn much more fully, the great truth that "the Bible is distinguished from all other books as being a book of principles, not a string of texts." That the Biblical critic—however learned and accomplished—if nothing more, must ever find it a sealed book, since, as the Master of Balliol has beautifully said, while "other writings merely ask for the comprehension of their statements, the exercise of a clear logical faculty; these, mediating between two worlds, the visible and the invisible, often seem to indicate much that can be powerfuly felt in the heart, although scarcely, if at all, capable of being translated into words, and demand *sympathy*, as an essential condition to the right understanding of passages, beyond the power of philosophy to analyse, yet full of meaning *to him who catches the accent.*" Hence, while the letter will never be despised, we shall cease more and more to be in bondage to it, nor shall we deem it only due deference to its Divine authority to hang the destiny of the mass of mankind on the meaning of a Greek adjective, or impale the character of God upon the point of an "inspired" antithesis. For, as in the stereoscope we must look through a double glass upon two pictures, the same and yet distinct, in order that the object represented may stand out sharply and in strong relief, so we shall learn that we need at once the revelation of the word without and the revelation of the Spirit within, in order that Divine truth may be seen by the eye of the soul with perfect clearness and in true perspective.* And

* "It is an awful thought," writes the late Dr. Norman Macleod, "that some men cannot bring God's own revealed truth into the light of reason and conscience. I have such profound faith in revealed truth *to* us as to rejoice that it shall be tried by what God has revealed *in* us. I would tremble for any truth that could be maintained by nothing more than the authority of the letter, by an 'it is written.' Jesus used this argument indeed, but it was to the devil, who had no spiritual eye to see."—*Life*, vol. ii. p. 315.

Digitized by Google

the realisation of this truth will at once render a hundred dreary controversies regarding the nature of inspiration useless, and deliver the children of God from the tender mercies of those theologians who, with texts and glosses, make nets in which to catch souls and hold them in a cruel bondage. Christians, no longer fenced in by human interpretations, will walk forth amid the fields and gardens of revelation in the enjoyment of the liberty wherewith the truth has made them free; not careful to prove that every poppy that grows among the corn and every daisy among the flowers has been purposely planted there by the heavenly husbandman, seeing that in the field the ripening wheat stands thick, and in the gardens the parterres are bright with flowers of every hue.

II. Again, the Christianity of the future must, we apprehend, be based on a higher, more benignant, and truer conception of the character of God than has hitherto obtained generally among theologians; such a conception, namely, as finds its realisation only in the sacred and endearing name of FATHER. That God is the *Father* of *all men*, and not merely of a comparatively small number of arbitrarily elected favourites, or as arbitrarily-endowed immortals, is a truth which Christianity must joyfully accept if it is not deservedly to perish. In truth, how it could ever have been doubted by Christians, seeing that it is the very foundation of Christ's teaching, is hard to understand apart from the assumption of malign spiritual influences, darkening the minds and hardening the hearts of even Christ's most earnest, holy, and devoted followers. For s not this conception of the Divine Fatherhood the deepest and purest aspiration of universal humanity? "In exploring the ancient archives of language," says Max Müller, "we found that the highest God had received the same name in the ancient mythology of India, Greece, Italy, and Germany, and had retained that name whether worshipped on the Himalayan mountains, or among the oaks of Dodona, on the Capitol, or in the forests of Germany. I pointed out that his name was *Dyaus* in Sanskrit, *Zeus* in Greek, *Jovis* in Latin, *Tiu* in German; but I hardly dwelt with sufficient strength on the startling nature of this discovery. These names are not mere names; they are historical facts, ay, facts more immediate, more trustworthy, than many facts of medieval history. These words are not mere words, but they bring before us, with all the vividness of an event which we witnessed ourselves but yesterday, the ancestors of the whole Aryan race, thousands of years it may be before Homer and the Veda, worshipping an unseen Being, under the self-same name, the best, the most exalted name they could find in their vocabulary —under the name of Light and Sky.

"And let us not turn away, and say that this was after all but nature-worship and idolatry. No, it was not meant for that, though it may have been degraded into that in later times; *Dyaus* did not mean the blue sky, nor was it simply the sky personified: it was meant for something else. We have in the Veda the invocation *Dyaus Piter*, the Greek Ζεῦ πάτερ, the Latin *Jupiter*; and that means in all the three languages what it meant before these three languages were torn asunder —it means Heaven-Father! These two words are not mere words; they are to my mind the oldest poem, the oldest prayer of mankind, or at least of that pure branch of it to which we belong—and I am as firmly

Digitized by Google

convinced that this prayer was uttered, that this name was given to the unknown God before Sanskrit was Sanskrit and Greek was Greek, as, when I see the Lord's prayer in the language of Polynesia and Melanesia, I feel certain that it was first uttered in the language of Jerusalem. We little thought when we heard for the first time the name of Jupiter, degraded it may be by Homer or Ovid into a scolding husband or a faithless lover, what sacred records lay enshrined in this unholy name. We shall have to learn the same lesson again and again in the science of religion, viz., that the place whereon we stand is holy ground. Thousands of years have passed since the Aryan nations separated to travel to the north and the south, the west and the east: they have each founded empires and philosophies, they have each built temples and razed them to the ground; they have all grown older, and it may be wiser and better; but when they search for a name for what is most exalted and yet most dear to every one of us, when they wish to express both awe and love, the infinite and the finite, they can but do what their old fathers did when gazing up to the eternal sky, and feeling the presence of a Being, as far as far and as near as near can be: they can but combine the self-same words, and utter once more the primeval Aryan prayer, Heaven-Father, in that form which will endure for ever, 'Our Father which art in heaven.'" *

And this beautiful aspiration of the heart of universal humanity Christ has made a glorious certainty by being himself essentially the revelation of THE FATHER. His hand alone has drawn aside the successive veils which hid this innermost sanctuary of the Divine Glory, and—as in a Holy of Holies—revealed to the tearful longing eyes, and given to the trembling outstretched arms of our suffering and dying race, the image of the Infinite and Immutable Goodness. Christ came not for the purpose of revealing God as *Creator*, that had been done, as Paul tells us, "by the things that are made"—the visible *Kosmos*—in which "the eternal power and Godhead" may be "clearly seen" (Rom. i. 18). Christ came not to reveal God as the righteous moral Ruler—the sovereign and the judge—that had been done amid the thunders of Sinai, when, "so terrible was the sight that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake." Christ came to reveal God as *the Father*, and there is no other revelation of God peculiar to his teaching. He was himself "the brightness of his—*the Father's*—glory, and the express image of his person" (Heb. i. 3). He could therefore say, "He that hath seen me hath seen *the Father*." (John xiv. 9.) "*The Father* that dwelleth in me he doeth the works." (John xiv. 10.) "The word which ye hear ("my sayings") is not mine, but *the Father's* which sent me." (Ver. 24.) "When ye pray say, *Our Father* which art in the heavens." (Luke xi. 2.)

It was manifestly as *the Father* that "God so loved *the world* that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." (John iii. 16.) For only by the Father could "the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of *the Father*" be "given." So Christ speaks of "*the Father* which sent him," and of "coming forth from *the Father*;" and the apostle John distinctly tells us that "*the Father* sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world."

* *Science of Religion*, pp. 171-3.

Digitized by Google

(1 John iv. 14.) Hence, in the matchless parable of the Prodigal Son, the sole and abiding relationship indicated between God and the sinner is that of *father* and *child*. The prodigal was as truly, though not as manifestly, a son when in the far country he fed on husks amid the swine, as when clothed in "the best robe" he feasted on the fatted calf in his father's house. For is it not written: "A certain man had *two sons*" —"the younger *son* gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country"—"and he arose and came to *his father*"—"*his father* saw him, and had compassion, and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him"—"and *the father* said to his servants . . . This *my son* was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found?" How touchingly, too, is this still abiding relationship as it were instinctively recognised by the poor wanderer, even in his lowest estate, when he says, "I will arise and go to *my father!*" And though he goes but to beg for a servant's place, yet the very first word sobbed out on the bosom of the Divine tenderness is, "*Father*, I have sinned." Well does Dr. David Brown say—the fire of a divine emotion kindling and dissolving for a moment the icy barriers of his narrow Calvinism—"'*Father!*'—Mark the term! Though 'no more *worthy* to be called his son,' the prodigal sinner is taught to claim the *degraded* and *defiled*, but *still existing* relationship, asking not to be made a servant, but *remaining a son* to be made '*as* a servant,' willing to take the lowest place and do the meanest work. . . . When but the face is thus turned *homeward*, though as yet far, far away, our Father recognises his own child in us, and bounds to meet us—not saying, Let him come to me and sue me for pardon first, but himself taking the first step, yea, 'falling on his neck and kissing him.' What! In his filth? Yes. In his rags? Yes. 'Our Father, is this thy portraiture?' It is even so. (Jer. xxxi. 20.) And because it is so, I wonder not that such incomparable teaching hath made the world new." *

And yet how slow has not the world alone but the Church itself—those who profess to have themselves experienced this Divine love—been to learn this glorious truth. How commonly even yet is a God of capriciously bestowed affections and of limited parental liabilities, the highest conception that devout Christians can attain to. For our own part we are constrained to say that it is with a feeling of strange and sad surprise that we find beloved and honoured brethren venturing the assertion that though "the relation of Father, in the bare sense of Creator, cannot, as a matter of fact, be abolished—'we are all his offspring'—in every other and higher sense, involving moral relationship and eternal love, it is declared to be non-existent in reference to impenitent men;" and seeking to establish this terrible conclusion by quoting our Lord's words to the Jews, "Ye are of your father the devil" (John viii. 44); apparently oblivious of the fact that the immediate context of the passage furnishes an argument *pari passu* quite as valid to prove that those Jews were not actually the children of Abraham. (See vers 39-41.) But surely these hard thoughts of him "whose nature and whose name is love," are "but the haunting shadows of the dark and terrible dogmas which have for generations oppressed the Church and repelled the world," but which, we dare to cherish the conviction, will, from the clearer heaven of the faith in Christ that is to be, have vanished quite away.

* "*Commentary on the Gospels*," *in. loc.*

Digitized by Google

III. Again, we confidently anticipate the full and frank recognition by the Christianity of the future, of the great truth that the reign of law obtains as absolutely and uniformly in the moral and spiritual as it manifestly does in the physical sphere of God's universe, and that consequently a solution of moral or spiritual continuity is as inconceivable as is the solution of physical continuity. In the light of this sublime generalisation such inspired words as these will receive a new and for the first time an adequate interpretation: "God is no respecter of persons." "Be not deceived, God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ: that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." "Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be."

One inevitable and most influential inference from the reception of this truth will be the elimination of all idea of the arbitrary and capricious appointment of either eternal reward or eternal punishment at the hands of God. It will be seen, on the one hand, that, as Mr. J. Guinness Rogers has well said, "The call of the Gospel is to the exercise of the highest virtue; a call to love God, and to be a blessing to men; a call to everything that tends to make life a glory and a joy, a call to gentleness and loving kindness; and he only who answers the call really obeys the Gospel." And on the other hand it will be as clearly perceived that whatever terrors, suffering, or death the unseen and eternal world may hold for the impenitent and obdurate sinner, they will not be in any sense the vindictive inflictions of an infuriated Deity, but rather the due reward of their deeds,—the impartial and undeviating working out of the holy, just, good, and therefore inexorable laws of God's moral and spiritual universe. That in accordance with those laws sin ever blights and holiness ever blesses. That heaven and hell alike are in the man, not appointed for him; the blessedness of the former and the misery of the latter being equally the inevitable consequence of his moral character and spiritual condition: both being, in all their nice gradations of joy and misery, not conditions made for us, but capacities wrought out in us. In one word, that the blazon on the heavenly banner under which we each one of us advance to our final destiny, be that destiny life and glory, or judgment and death,—is this: "*Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap.*"

And closely allied with this will be seen another truth,—or rather we should, perhaps, speak of it as another side of the same truth,—namely, that *character, and character alone is destiny.* That it is not what, in the way of "bodily exercise," a man may have performed; not what, in all intellectual honesty, he may have believed in his heart and confessed before men, but what he really *is*, that must, under the great law of spiritual gravitation, fix for him "his own place" in the eternal world. That the one supreme and ultimate aim of Christianity is *the production of the Christ-like character*, or, as Paul expresses it, "conformity to the image of God's (model) Son;" and that except as they may be promotive of the formation of this perfect character, neither rites nor sacraments, faith, nor the confession of it, can profit us anything. It is well that the truth should be clearly apprehended in this day of

Digitized by Google

large credulity and little faith, of loud profession and lawless practice, that only by the clear manifestation of its divine and *still abiding* power, as a great spiritual force, to produce a higher type of character than the religious history of the world has otherwise developed, can Christianity vindicate her claim to be something more and better than "the last of the mythologies." It has been truly said that, "the chief danger against which we have most need to guard in the breaking up of old theories is lest men should come to think lightly of sin, think lightly of rejecting the Gospel, think lightly of turning away from Christ." But against any such danger,—the existence of which we would be the last to question,—this truth we believe will prove the best, we might even say the only effectual safeguard. Character is destiny; the faith that transforms is the only faith which saves: "Without holiness no man *can* see the Lord." In the searching light of this eternal truth how many a noisy profession would even now be silenced, and how much zeal for God shown to be nothing better than the delusion of others by those who had first succeeded in deluding themselves. How clearly would it be seen, too, that the saved alone can save; and that while to save others, or rather to help others to save themselves,—for we must each one work out *our own salvation* with fear and trembling,—is ever a binding Christian duty and blessed Christian privilege, to save ones'-self, not from the impossible horror of a material hell, not from the anthropomorphic wrath of an angry God, not even from the painfulness of sin, but from its bondage and power, is a more binding and pressing duty still.

Have we ever asked ourselves what it was that Christ, when here on earth, called upon men to believe in, when he called upon them to believe in Himself. It was not that he was the Son of God in any mere technical theological sense, for as such he had not been revealed. It was not that he was the great sacrifice for the sin of the world, for his sacrificial death had not yet been accomplished. It was not that he was the giver of an endless life, for not till he had risen from the dead had immortality been brought to light. No; the belief he challenged was *belief in his divine character:* to believe in Christ was to believe in purity, meekness, truth, righteousness, loving-kindness, self-sacrifice, and no man really believes in these things who does not practise them: this faith written inwardly in the soul, and outwardly in the life, was and is the only possible salvation.

Such, as we believe, will be the rationale of retribution in the Christianity of the future, and in thus basing it on broad ethical principles, not on any theological expedients or legal fictions intended to evade their legitimate operation, it will not only "commend itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God," but invest the conviction of its inevitableness with a living and tremendous force from which disobedience will feel that there is no escape, while obedience will derive from it its truest and most unfailing inspiration.

IV. Lastly,—for we must not attempt to prolong the vision while yet so much is dark,—we need hardly, in the pages of the RAINBOW, express our conviction that among the established axioms of the Christianity of the future will be found *the non-eternity of evil.* That only purity and truth and goodness have in them a divine immortal strength, because they only are in harmony with the eternal order of God's universe, and

Digitized by Google

that, conversely, evil, whatever may be its form, and wherever it may be found, bears within it the sentence of its own final extinction; all evil things and evil beings being surrounded by the immutable and irresistible laws of the moral world, even as by an ever-contracting circle of fire, the quenchless flame of which must ultimately consume all that it cannot assimilate. That so at last the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and his Christ shall be established, and his will done in all worlds as now it is at least done in one; this will no longer be "an open question," a tolerated eccentricity of thought, but a glorious certainty,—the very lode-star of the hopes of our race.

No longer, therefore, will the great conflict with the powers of evil be carried on in the disheartening prospect of a divided victory, as though while it were true, on the one hand, that Christ was "manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil," it were equally true, on the other, that the devil will succeed in marring the work of Christ. But the fulness of those great words of promise which shine with such peerless splendour in the firmament of revelation, will be accepted with joyful assurance of faith: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." "According to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him." "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom of God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. . . . And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." "And there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away. And he that sitteth on the throne said, Behold, I make all things new."

Yet, if we apprehend the truth aright, it will be neither through the wide unfenced way, into which every thief and robber may freely enter, of a universalism which extenuates the evil of sin at the cost of eternal righteousness; nor by the hard and narrow path of a doctrine of "Life in Christ," which only means life in Christ for the few, and destruction out of Christ for the many, as though Christ had not united himself with humanity, but only with some insignificant fragment thereof,—that this glorious goal of hope will be attained. It will certainly not be in the prospect of vast scenes of desolation in a fire-swept universe, where all hope is extinguished, all life has died, and only the poor triumph of destructive power remains for God, that the aspirations of the future will be satisfied, or any rest of soul attained. Nor will it be by denuding man of his noblest and most God-like attribute of will, and reducing our hopes concerning him to a mean automatic theory of universal salvation; as though men were after all but puppets in the hands of the Great Showman, which can be *made* to dance to any music. No; it will rather be in a wider and yet more discriminative estimate of God's vast and as yet perhaps scarcely touched resources; and a deeper and more loving sympathy with the Divine Patience which fails not, nor is discouraged because of the long-suffering it has to exercise. In the candid re-



Digitized by Google

cognition of the fact that the probability of any individual developing in a single life-time the *needed capacity* for salvation, depends so largely upon his inherited characteristics, material and moral, as well as upon his "surroundings," i.e., upon those incidents of his lot over which he has absolutely no control, that it may require other opportunities, in other worlds, and in varied circumstances, to place the possibility of attaining, and hence the responsibility of rejecting, salvation fairly within the range of every candidate's volition.* Or, in other words, and to view the matter more in the concrete, by accepting the fact, attested alike by Scripture and experience, of a present limited election of individuals, not simply to salvation, but to high priestly and kingly offices in the coming kingdom of God, not as in itself an ultimate end, but as the necessary antecedent to his wider and more universal purposes of mercy—as yet but very partially revealed—regarding our race as a whole. Though at the same time there will be no ignoring of the darker alternative—as lying within the range of man's unviolated freedom of volition—of there being found at last "manifold states of confirmed sinfulness, frightful attitudes of enduring hostility against Divine love, petrifactions of ingratitude, embodiments of sin against the Holy Ghost"† which it will be the last sad office of Divine Love itself to allow to "perish in their own corruption."

How rapidly, or how slowly, these great features of the Christianity of the future may become more sharply defined and more clearly recognisable, through the dissolving veil of the tradition of the present, or how far we have failed to prophesy and only dreamed, it is not for us to say. It may be that, to recur once more to our original illustration, as it sometimes happens that even in a saturated solution, crystallisation cannot commence till a rod of glass, wood, or some other material is introduced into it, to act as a nucleus; even so, perhaps, it will not be till Christ in glorified humanity comes again, and we possess the constant and living revelation of his presence, that the dissolved elements of divine truth already communicated to us, enriched it may be by new accessions, will group themselves afresh around him in forms of enduring and consummate perfection. Meanwhile let us be thankful for such prophetic glimpses of the Christianity of the future—the pressing need of the development of which so many sanctified minds are recognising, and so many devout hearts long to see—as may be vouchsafed to us; let our willingness to receive them be sincere and earnest; and let us be assured that, as another has so truly and strikingly said, that Church, that party, that Christianity "is doomed to perish which anchors itself in the seemingly safe roadstead of creeds bristling with anathemas, and of ecclesiastical systems frowning down inquiry, leaving it for more adventurous barks to sail out over the great seas which heave with speculation, and are storm-swept with thought. Whilst thus at anchor the timbers are rotting, the canvas and cordage decaying, and the crew growing old. And, at last, even in the quiet roadstead will be felt the strain of the agitation without, and whether they will or no, they too must drift out, but with faint hearts and feeble hands, upon 'sunless gulfs of doubt.'"

4, Kingsdown Road, Upper Holloway. W. Maude.

* See Mr. W. R. Greg's letter in *Spectator*, August 11th, 1877.
† Bishop Ellicott, "Destiny of the Creature," p. 90.

Digitized by Google

## FRESH WITNESSES.

F rom Westminster has lately come a voice
A t which all Rainbow readers will rejoice;
R efreshing those already further taught,
R ousing to life full many a slumbering thought;
A rdent, impassioned, yet withal exact:—
R eligion, Reason, hail with joy the fact!

D o you desire, beside the preacher's aid,
A n orator, for platform service made?
L ist to the voice which fills our Midland halls,
E xciting close attent where'er it falls.

C an more be wished?—his help is rendered then,
O f scholarly, ornate, industrious Pen,
'X acting homage from all thoughtful men.

1. *One* might enumerate names of earlier note,
8. *Eight* such, or more, we easily could quote;
7. *Seven*-times-eleven, deserves a passing cheer:—
7. *Seven*-ty-and Eight,—bid witness fresh appear!

Sandown, I.W. John Cooke Westbrook.

---

## PROFESSOR TORRANCE ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

MY attention has been drawn to a sermon addressed by Professor Torrance, of Woodstock, to the Ontario Baptist Conference and Convention. It is on the all-important subject of the future of the impenitent. As he has throughout his discourse referred to my arguments on this subject, I have been asked to reply to him in the Rainbow.

It would be impossible in the space allotted to me to examine every statement of his. I will therefore pass over the earlier portion of his sermon, in which he treats of "man's composition." His metaphysical reasoning here does not throw much additional light on the matter, and I will therefore pass to what he calls his Scriptural proofs that man can exist without his body; though in his previous reflections, compelled by the plain testimony of Scripture, he had confessed that the body was an original and essential part of the composition of man. "*Man is dust!*" he had said, when commenting on Gen. ii. 7. This dust, the body, is only man's house or garment, without which he has a perfect existence, he says somewhat later on; for which he gives as the reason that the soul is immortal, and is the true and real man, who can go forth from his dwelling and continue to exist, just as naturally as we now, in this life, can go forth from our dwelling-house. So completely does he turn round and contradict his own admission that man was truly dust!

It struck me very strongly in reading the sermon that in a long discourse, whose main object, as directed against what the preacher calls the "extinction view," is to prove from Scripture the immortality of all



Digitized by Google

men, or the immortality of all human souls, he never quoted a passage which makes any such statement. Abundant passages there are which call man mortal and which affirm that the soul that sinneth shall die. Such declarations occur readily to every one acquainted with his Bible. But so much as one affirming that man is naturally immortal, or that the souls of all men will continue to exist or live for ever, Mr. Torrance does not furnish. I assume that he has not done so, because in the whole of the Scriptures, Old and New Testament alike, there is not one such passage to be found.

Now this is a very important fact. We all know how among reasoners of Professor Torrance's school the perpetual assertion is made that man is an immortal creature, that the soul of man can never die. Every sermon, every speech, every book of theirs upon this subject, abounds with such expressions. They cannot utter their view without them. How is it that in the book of God whicht reats so fully and solemnly upon this question, such expressions never occur, while declarations of an opposite character abound throughout? We ask Mr. Torrance to turn his attention to this and to explain this wonderful omission when next he addresses a Baptist Conference. Charles Wesley sings:—

"A charge to keep I have,
A God to glorify;
A *never-dying soul* to save,
And fit it for the sky."

Why is such language not only absent from, but contradicted by, the Bible?

In arguing against our view Mr. Torrance calls it "*the Extinction View.*" It is rather curious how fond our antagonists are of using, as descriptive of our view, some word not found in the English version of Scripture. Annihilation is such a word, extinction is another. Now we do not object to such terms. They truly describe our view. But there are other words which just as correctly describe it; which are, as our opponents allow, identical in sense; which are found in the English version; and which we prefer to use. Why does not Mr. Torrance call our view "the Destruction View?" He knows that destruction, annihilation, and extinction all mean the same thing. Perhaps it occurred to him that if he called it "the Destruction View" his hearers and readers might remember the oft-repeated passages of Scripture in which the punishment of the wicked is called their destruction! But let this pass, I do not quarrel with his appellative. I hold "the Extinction View." I rejoice to believe that in our Father's world evil will one day be extinct. I should gravely doubt his power or his love if I thought it would be eternal.

The Extinction View, Mr. Torrance tells us, "is principally based upon what its advocates *deem* the literal rendering of the language used to describe the penalty of sin, together with their view of man as being *wholly material.*"

I stop for one moment to point out the misrepresentation. We do not hold man to be "wholly material." In my work upon Hades (chap. i.) I stated that man in his original was made out of the dust of the earth. But in succeeding chapters I gave a great deal of attention to the Scriptural teaching that living man is possessed of a spirit, breathed into him

Digitized by Google

by God. We deny, therefore, that it is correct to say of our theory that it describes man as "wholly material." We pass on to examine more fully into what is our grand reliance in this great question; viz., the meaning of the language employed in Scripture to describe the punishment of the wicked.

We base our view, Mr. Torrance tells his readers, on what we "*deem the literal rendering*" of Scripture language upon this question. I draw attention to that little word "*deem*." Its purport as used here is to insinuate that what we deem or suppose to be the literal rendering of Scripture may be only our opinion, not justified by fact. We ask the Professor to tell us if he thinks that the meaning we attribute to the words of Scripture is not their literal sense. If so, we ask him to produce a single word on which we place a sense which is not its literal sense. We will venture to reply for him that he is unable to do so. He should then have omitted that word "deem." It conveys an insinuation for which there is no excuse. Artifices of this kind are unworthy of a discourse addressed to "fathers and brethren" at a solemn conference.

I base my view on what *is* the literal rendering of the language of Scripture. Let our readers reflect on this account of our view allowed by our adversaries. We do not set aside the authority of Scripture: we bow to it. We do not rely upon secondary, figurative, far-fetched meanings of its language, but on the literal, primary sense, as found in every language, both in those Hebrew and Greek tongues in which the Scriptures were originally written, and in every one of those tongues into which it has been translated.

We ask any thoughtful mind if any course can be conceived fairer, juster, more becoming the creatures of God. He has told us his will and mind upon what is to us the most solemn of all questions, our eternal condition in the world to come. He has had his mind written for us in a book. He has there described the future of the reprobate by many terms. What should we do with these? Should we not examine what is the primary, obvious, usual sense, not of one or two, but of all these terms? Should we not take them in that sense in which every nation interprets the solemn language of its laws? This is what we have done.

But Mr. Torrance makes some attempt to show that while it is the universal practice of mankind to interpret their laws by the primary sense of the terms in which they are written, Scripture departs from this established and wise method, and instead of using its terms in their primary sense uses them in some secondary or figurative sense. His first reference is to Matthew xviii. 17—"Let him be unto thee as an *heathen* (ethnikos) man and a publican." He tells us that "heathen" (ethnikos) is not here used in its primary sense but in a secondary one.

With all respect, we tell him that he is quite mistaken in supposing that the primary sense of ethnikos (heathen) is here excluded. It is plainly included just as much as the primary sense of "publican" with which it is connected. As used primarily it refers, as Mr. T. allows, to the nations of the world not including the Jews. The simple meaning of the text is this, that if the offending party spoken of in the 15th verse refused to hear the Church, he was to be regarded as the Jews regarded *other nations* and publicans, namely, as aliens and strangers. The pri-

Digitized by Google

mary sense is fully kept in view. The Professor is rather unfortunate in the first text he has chosen for the overthrow of our position. Let us see if he is more so in the next.

He refers to Genesis ii. 17 with a great air of triumph. He rejects with scorn the sense we here put upon "death," as "the cessation of existence," because Adam continued to live some eight hundred years after his sin. He tells us that we must therefore look here for some secondary meaning for that death which was threatened as the penalty of sin.

Let us see how Mr. T.'s canon of interpretation squares with his own interpretation of this very passage, and with that of his school. Here is Poole's comment on the penalty, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die"—"With a threefold death. 1. Spiritual, by the guilt and power of sin. 2. Temporal, or the death of the body, which shall then begin in thee. 3. Eternal." This is the stereotyped sense put upon death in this passage by that orthodox school of theology to which Mr. Torrance belongs, and whose teaching he upholds. According to him and his school the text runs thus:—"In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die a spiritual, a temporal, and an eternal death." Thus, while he finds fault with us for saying that physical or temporal death was meant by the penalty threatened to Adam, he not only says the very same, but also includes another death which did not then even begin to be inflicted, viz., eternal death! Such is his consistency! He has left untouched the explanation of one who was fully as orthodox and learned as he, Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, who thus explains the penalty of Gen. ii. 17: "Along with the fruit they did also fall under the power of sin, because they did eat in disobedience; and disobedience to God entails death. Wherefore, as they became forfeit to death, *from that moment* they were handed over to it." (Against Heresies, v. xxiii.)

There are several texts which Mr. T. advances in proof that the future punishment of hell is not extinction or destruction, of which we cannot see the force. Thus he cites Romans i. 18-24. Will our readers carefully look at this passage?—"The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men," &c. (ver. 18.) Does the fact that, in the Gospel of Christ, God's anger against sin is revealed, prove that he will not destroy or annihilate sinners hereafter? We cannot see that it does; but Mr. Torrance sees it clearly. Does the statement in the 24th and 26th verses, that God gave up the heathen to uncleanness and vile affections in this life prove that he will not destroy them in the next? We fail to see any connection; but Mr. Torrance sees a close one. We cannot help saying that this array of texts which have nothing to do with the subject is but the exhibition of a weak cause.

Here is another text which Mr. T. advances to overthrow our view. In Matt. viii. 12 we read, "The children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." He asks, is the "intense conscious suffering," here spoken of, "no part of sin's penalty?" His words have no meaning if they do not convey the assertion that we, in our theory of punishment, deny that there will be any conscious pain in hell!

When a man in Mr. Torrance's position, a Professor of Divinity,

Digitized by Google

speaking in God's name to the assembled ministry of a Christian Church, undertakes to controvert what he considers erroneous, he ought to be very careful to speak the truth. He has not spoken it here. He has read very carefully my work on "The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment." He frequently refers to it. It asserts over and over what he affirms that we deny, viz., conscious suffering as part of future punishment. I refer the reader specially to chap. xii. in the 5th edition.

We may be sure that Mr. Torrance does not omit special reference to the oft-quoted text of Matt. xxv. 46. From his tone here we might imagine our cause was hopelessly lost. He says that we always insist on using the terms referring to future punishment in their primary sense; that here is a Greek word, *kolasis*, translated "punishment," whose primary sense is "*pruning*;" and consequently, if we are consistent with our principles, we should thus translate it in Matt. xxv. 46. So translated, he says, the passage would overthrow our view, since pruning is a very different thing from destruction or annihilation. However plausible, this reasoning is wholly without force. I do not deny that the primary original sense of *kolasis* is "pruning." But when it is thus used it is *used exclusively of trees*. When the word is applied to men it never has this meaning in the Greek language. It then signifies punishment of any and of every kind. It includes every punishment, from the lightest to the extreme penalty of death. What then becomes of the Professor's triumphant refutation of my principle of interpretation? I do not, it is true, use *kolasis* in its primary sense as applied to trees, because Christ is not speaking of trees; but I use it in its primary, proper, usual sense as applied to men, for it is of men our Lord is speaking. I do not violate in any measure my principle of interpretation. I do not need his impassioned appeal to consistency to return to me, for she has not left me at all.

But Mr. Torrance is not yet done with Scripture. He next advances Romans ii. 8, 9, where St. Paul speaks of "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," as coming upon all who "obey not the truth." Surely, he says, even a child may see that intense suffering, not extinction, is here represented as the penalty of sin. Now there are few passages which are less to his purpose than this. He knows, of course, of what is called the *context* of a passage, and of the propriety of taking the context into account. I ask him to turn to the 7th verse of this chapter, and he will find that the idea of extinction which he supposes to have been wholly absent from the apostle's mind in regard of the wicked was really present to it:—"To them," says St. Paul, "who by patient continuance in well-doing *seek for* glory and honour and *immortality*," God will render "*eternal* life." What is the idea conveyed here? It is that "immortality" is a thing to be sought for if it is to be gained. That "immortality" which Mr. Torrance and his awful school would force upon the wicked as their most terrible curse, the apostle understood and taught to be a blessing only to be gained by "patient continuance in well-doing." The extinction of the wicked, an extinction associated with conscious suffering, was fully in the apostle's mind. According to his theology God's glorious attribute of immortality shall never be associated with evil. I commend to Mr. Torrance's serious thought the admirable comment of the old and orthodox father Irenæus upon another

Digitized by Google

text of the apostle, very similar in sense to the passage before us, 1 Cor. ix. 24-27: "This able wrestler, therefore, exhorts us to the *struggle for immortality*, that we may be crowned, and may deem the crown precious, namely, that which is acquired by our struggle, but *which does not encircle us of its own accord.*" (Against Heresies, iv., xxxvii. 7.) Immortality, according to Irenæus and Paul and God's blessed word, is *never* a curse or a punishment, but is always a glorious prize.

Unable to deny that Scripture invariably represents "eternal life" as the exclusive possession of the people of God, Mr. Torrance would put upon "life" the sense of good order and happiness, while he finds grave fault with me for saying that "life, and life's happiness are distinct things." He tells us that "*existence*" is separable from happiness, but that "life" is not. Now, we cannot allow even a Canadian Professor to alter the meaning of the English language for his own purposes. If he had looked into the great American dictionary of Webster he would find that "life" means "existence," and "existence" means "life," and that consequently what may be affirmed of the one word may be affirmed of the other. If he had studied to any purpose literature, profane or sacred, he would have ascertained that "life, and life's happiness" are distinct and separable things. As this question is a most important one in our controversy, we will select some passages to the point, and then make a few observations upon "life and life's happiness," which ought to be inseparable, but which, alas, are often not.

Pope is universally looked upon as a consummate master of the English tongue. In temperament he was unhappy, and his bodily constitution was not good. "*Through this long disease, my life,*" is the language in which he describes his existence. Life and its happiness were with him distinguishable things. Here is a fragment of Mæcenas thus translated in page 8 of Farrar's "Seekers after God:"

"Numb my hands with palsy,
Rack my feet with gout,
Hunch my back and shoulder,
Let my teeth fall out;
Still, *if life be granted,*
I prefer the loss:
*Save my life, and give me*
*Anguish on the cross.*

Life and life's happiness are very distinct things here. The following anecdote of the death of Caius Caligula Cæsar, taken from p. 73 of Farrar's work, brings this out in a very forcible manner. After being fearfully wounded in the throat and jaw by his assassins, we are told that "he crouched his limbs together to screen himself from further blows, screaming aloud, *I live, I live.*"

But professors of Mr. Torrance's school are very much given to telling us that the language of common life and that of the Bible are two very different languages, to be interpreted on very different principles. Let us then direct Mr. Torrance to one or two passages in Scripture which carry out with tremendous power the sentiment he condemns in us—that life and life's happiness are distinct and distinguishable things. "Wherefore," says Job in his anguish, "wherefore is light given to him that is in misery, and *life unto the bitter in soul;* which long for death

Digitized by Google

but it cometh not; and dig for it more than for hid treasures; which rejoice exceedingly and are glad when they can find the grave." (iii. 20-22.) Scripture here speaks of life just as profane literature does, as a thing separable, and often separated, from its happiness. I refer without quoting, to Gen. xlvii. 9; Job x. 1; 1 Kings xix. 4; Eccles. ii. 17; Jer. viii. 3.

But Professor Torrance is seriously apprehensive lest, if we allow life to be separable from happiness, it might perhaps turn out that the redeemed may be unhappy through that eternal life which God has promised them. He asks in consternation—"What proof have we that it may not be a miserable existence?"

He need not be uneasy on this score. There are abundant passages in Scripture which tell us that the eternal life will be a life of joy only. (See Psalm xvi. 11; Isa. xxv. 8; Rev. xxi. 4; xxii. 3.) But even if we had not such texts, we need be under no such dread as Mr. Torrance gives expression to. The character of God is the pledge, which no one who knows him can doubt, that eternal life must be a happy one. All life, *as given by God*, must be happy, most of all that life which resembles his own in being eternal. Between life, as given by him, and happiness, there must be a close, we would say an inseparable connection. It is when sin enters, and mars God's work, that the appalling discovery is made that life and happiness are separable things—that there may be such a thing in God's world as an unhappy life. But an unhappy life is an anomaly in that world, an anomaly which shall one day cease. Eternal life and its blessing comes from God through Christ just as natural life and its blessing comes from him. When we speak of life as given by God we imply all that is essential to that life in its completeness. The life of a plant implies the moisture and nourishment and heat required by it for its healthy growth. The life of one of the inferior animals implies also its requirements of a different and a higher kind. The life of an immortal being, such as angels are, and such as the redeemed shall be, implies all that is requisite for this creature who possesses a life like to God's,—all that is wanted to keep in healthy and joyful exercise all their noble faculties.

There is yet one other point to which we must refer in defence of our position as attacked by Mr. Torrance. He objects to my statement that "Scripture represents eternal life as a gift not yet enjoyed by the people of God," and advances as opposed to it those passages which represent them as now possessing this life.

No doubt, as he says, Scripture tells us that the believer now has eternal life. With all his texts to this purpose and others I am familiar. But I beg to draw his attention to the fact that there are a yet greater number of texts which speak of eternal life as only promised, as not yet enjoyed, but to be enjoyed in the age to come. (See Mark x. 30; Rom. ii. 7; Titus i. 2; 1 John ii. 15.)

How are these two classes of texts to be reconciled? Simply on a principle perpetually asserted in Scripture, and which represents God's promises and purposes as so certain and sure that what he promises is regarded as already given. In 2 Tim. i. 9, St. Paul tells us that God's grace was "given us *before the world began*." In 1 Cor. iii. 22, he tells us that "*things to come*" are even now ours. And St. Peter in 1 Eph.

Digitized by Google

v. 1, tells us that he was in his earthly state "a partaker of the *glory that shall be revealed.*" Similar passages Mr. T. can find in abundance. Wholly inexplicable on his theory, they are perfectly reconcilable upon that view of mine which he is pleased to pronounce a contradiction, that eternal life, while it is ours now in God's faithful promise, is not yet enjoyed by us, nor will be, until the resurrection of the just.

I now finish my review of the main part of Mr. Torrance's sermon. I think the reader will see even from these brief remarks how feeble its argument is. Into the "ethical portion" of the question he declines to enter. I do not wonder. Men are getting ashamed of defending the justice of a theory which punishes with endless torment the sins of a brief life-time. As already stated, I had not room to enter upon his view of "Man's Composition," which forms the opening part of his sermon. But I will just refer to one passage which, according to Mr. Torrance, absolutely teaches his view that man can "exist out of the body," namely, 2 Cor. xii. 2—"I knew a man in Christ fourteen years ago (whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body I cannot tell: God knoweth); such an one caught up to the third heaven." Mr. Torrance's comment on the passage is this:—"If language can teach the possibility of existence, and that conscious existence, out of the body, then it is here." According to him there is not in the whole of Scripture, a passage which more distinctly teaches his view of human nature and contradicts mine than the above.

How is it then, if this language be so very plain, that writers and thinkers who agree with Mr. Torrance in his view of human nature do not see it in the light that he does? Poole gives a different view which he represents as the most probable and usual, and Poole was thoroughly acquainted with commentators on Scripture up to his time; and, moreover, quite agreed with Mr. Torrance that man could exist out of his body just as well as, if not much better than, in it. Here is Poole's view of 2 Cor. xii. 2:—"It is not very probable that his soul was separated from his body; but whether his body was, by some angel, carried up to the sight of this vision, *or things absent were made present to him*, the apostle himself, being deprived of the use of his senses, could not tell." Poole's explanation is that which the whole teaching of Scripture on the subject of prophetic vision endorses, namely, that the vision which was vouchsafed to Paul was either seen by him in the ordinary way of sense, he being bodily present, or that it was presented to him without the aid of his bodily senses as was very common in prophetic visions. Paul could not possibly have seen his visions in the way that the professor imagines *unless he had died*, for death is the separation of the soul from the body; and we do not know that even Mr. Torrance would tell us that Paul was dead when he saw the vision. (James ii. 26.) If so he must have died twice! And yet this text is the very strongest that Mr. Torrance can advance for his most unscriptural doctrine that man can have a conscious existence out of, and independently of the body. If this is his best support, how weak must his others be!

HENRY CONSTABLE.

---

Digitized by Google

# CORRESPONDENCE.

## THE NEED OF CONFERENCE TESTIMONY.

DEAR SIR,—There is no little fear that the Christian friends, supporters of the momentous doctrine, that "Eternal life is the Gift of God in Jesus Christ," may be accused of looking back after having put their hand to the plough. The reason is this, that there was no Conference held in 1877. Judging from what I heard from sympathetic brethren at Liverpool not long ago, I am of opinion that there is a desire to sustain a testimony under circumstances so happily conceived and effectually carried out in 1876. I must confess that I do not like our present position, and sincerely hope that adequate support may be given to the establishment of TRUTH at such annual meetings and greetings, that God may be glorified.

"A word in season, how good is it!"

I am faithfully yours,
H. GOODWYN.

Wellington House, Clevedon,
Somerset.

I venture to add a few crude suggestions as a tangible basis for the Conference, founded chiefly on the supposition that three-fourths of leading Christians do not see the works that are continually issuing from the Press in defence of the doctrine of non-inherent immortality, and who consequently require to be made acquainted with the fundamental principles on which it rests, and the increasing importance it is assuming in the minds of earnest thoughtful men:—

A. That the Conference be extended to two or three days, in order that

B. Influential advocates of the truth may be invited to take part, and

C. That some of them be requested to read instructive papers on the following subjects, or some of them:—

(1.) Historical inquiry into the origin of the dogma of inherent immortality.

(2.) Testimony of Scripture for or against the dogma, together with the subject of Life and Death, and the exact meaning of the words *as used therein*.

(3.) Scripture meaning of the words "soul" and "spirit." (1 Thess. v. 23.)

(4.) The Adamic creation, sin, and penalty.

(5.) Scriptural evidence for or against the doctrine of endless sufferings, or eternal punishment.

(6.) Evidence that the doctrine of eternal punishment is not necessary as a moral deterrent power.

(7.) The traditional doctrine of the intermediate state of the soul in relation to the New Testament revelation concerning the resurrection of the dead.

(8.) The question, as a whole, in relation to the divine purpose in the incarnation and sacrificial work of Jesus Christ the Son of God.

D. That quiet discussions, seasoned with grace, *confined absolutely to the subjects of the papers*, be permitted.

E. That a working committee be nominated by votes of the advocates of the cause, to arrange the time, place, and proceedings, and to give publicity to the whole. H. G.

Digitized by Google

## CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.

SIR,—General Goodwyn contends that immortality is not conditional because faith is the gift of God. But if it be dependent, as he maintains, on faith alone, it is "conditional" on God giving any one faith, just as much as if it were conditional on such person seeking it by patient continuance in well-doing. Still, I for one, to whom I believe belongs the credit or discredit of originating it, am perfectly willing to accept any better designation in its place; and I wish the General had suggested one.

Yours, &c.,

SAMUEL MINTON.

20, Warwick Square, S.W.

---

## A SOCIETY SUGGESTED.

DEAR SIR,—For the last fourteen or fifteen years I have been a firm believer in the impossibility of eternal suffering—a horrible doctrine, but surprisingly dear to many amiable and sincerely pious people. I have but lately, I regret to say, had the good fortune to find the Truth, as I believe it to be, so clearly and fearlessly shown as in the pages of the RAINBOW and a few works, notably that of the excellent Swiss pastor, Petavel, of a similar line of teaching. During all these years I have endeavoured to maintain the doctrine of conditional immortality to the best of my ability on all occasions. Had I known sooner of the RAINBOW and the few similarly minded works, how much stronger should I have felt my position to be! how much more powerful my reasoning! Now does not this suggest the desirability of forming a society, whose object shall be the spread of the doctrines you advocate? The work to be done is stupendous, and though a few faithful men may courageously combat the false dogma, the millions are still under its baleful shadow. Of the many persons to whom I have spoken on this matter hardly any have ever heard it suggested that eternal torment is contrary, not only to God's nature, but to his Word, and partly because of its novelty they fear to entertain it. If men's minds were directed to the subject, if people could be led to talk, think, and read about it, I cannot but believe the truth would prevail, and the greatest ally of infidelity be vanquished.

Other great objects have their organisations, but as far as I am aware, the vindication of the character of the God and Father of us all, and the most efficient bar to the progress of infidelity, are not so represented.

I have continually, when listening to the sermons of both churchmen and dissenting clergy striven to gather their opinions on this matter, and the impression usually left on my mind is, they don't believe in eternal torment, but are afraid to say so. I am, yours faithfully, E. D.

Weymouth.

---

## SIDE ISSUES.

DEAR SIR,—To the candid and thoughtful remarks of "An Inquirer," it may be briefly replied—1st. That even if the question of probation after death be "an essential element in the obtaining of right views regarding future retribution," it is certainly a "side issue" with respect to the ultimate doom of the finally impenitent. And 2nd. That "the record which God gave of His Son," so far from being "a bare affirmation that all

Digitized by Google

life is in Christ," and of no value "because it does not lead anywhere," is nothing less than the fulness of that very Gospel which is the power of God unto salvation. If our controversial efforts bear the fruits we anticipate, they will lead to the adoption of what is urged in the following "Appeal to Evangelists," which has been circulated in thousands as a handbill during the last few years.

MEN AND BRETHREN.—Preach "Life and Immortality" as "brought to light by the Gospel," and to be found in Christ alone. For God's sake and for man's sake, do not encourage a perishing world in its delusive dream of necessary Immortality. It is useless to warn men that, unless they repent, it will be to them an immortality of wretchedness. They neither can nor ought to believe that a God of perfect justice, to say nothing of infinite love, will inflict upon the creatures of His hand a curse that would shake creation to its centre, and blast the happiness of every intelligent being who was in any measure a partaker of the Divine nature. They neither can, nor ought to believe, that He who is "of purer eyes than to behold iniquity" will tolerate the eternal existence of moral evil, if He can possibly put an end to it. They will eagerly snatch at your well-meant, but fatal, admission that they are indestructible beings, capable of enduring anything that even Omnipotence can lay upon them, and who therefore must necessarily live for ever. Let that be granted, and the moral instinct, which God has implanted in their breasts, will assure them that sooner or later, in some way or other, they *must* be restored to His favour. They feel, though they may not be able to prove, that all who live for ever *must* ultimately "live unto God," that He *must* "be all in all," and unbroken harmony reign throughout His boundless Empire. Only assure them that they will then be alive, and nothing will make them believe, in the bottom of their hearts, that they will be excluded from the promised reconciliation of all things.

Oh, lift up your voices like trumpets; till the walls of this dangerous delusion fall down flat before the plain stern truth of God's Word, that "the wages of sin is *death*;" that the finally impenitent will be "*destroyed* body and soul in hell:" that if they "judge themselves unworthy of eternal life," by neglecting the offer of it made to them in the Gospel, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall *devour* the adversaries."

With what power would the Gospel message then come, offering "*eternal life*" to all who are willing to accept it as "the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord," offering glory and honour *and immortality*" to all who will seek it "by patient continuance in well-doing!" It is nothing to ask whether such great results do follow in the case of the few who preach this truth. What can be expected when each voice is drowned by a hundred others, assuring them that such a doom is impossible, that they all have "immortal souls," and that even their bodies, though naturally mortal, will hereafter put on immortality, whereby both body and soul will be secured an existence as lasting as that of the Creator Himself? But what might *not* be expected, if the united voice of the whole Church were to cry aloud, as clearly and boldly as the Bible does—Life and

Digitized by Google

Death are set before you ; therefore choose Life,—for why will ye die?

SAMUEL MINTON.

## Literature.

*The Ascent of Man* from Death to Life. By F. H. Morgan, M.A., Rector of Gisborough. London: Elliot Stock.

IN the form of conversation between scholar and master, Mr. Morgan writes suggestively rather than conclusively. We like to see an inquirer of this type, for we are sure that he will stand in midday beams shortly. Honest men who have mental power enough to shake off prejudices, will receive light from the Divine Teacher, and take rank with his fearless witnesses. This is Mr. Morgan's future, if we rightly interpret his present position in relation to the great questions of the day.

*A Lexicon of* New Testament Greek on a New Plan, by which the Greek New Testament may be translated into English with demonstrable accuracy by the simplest method.

*A Companion* to the Lexicon of New Testament Greek on a New Plan, in which the TEN THOUSAND Inflexions of the Greek verbs are arranged with a Double Index, so as to afford the quickest possible reference. London: Elliot Stock.

ONCE one masters the "new plan," which at first seems obscure, these books are found very serviceable to the student. The prefaces explain the system on which they are arranged. They deserve the praise of useful manuals.

*The Seven Seals Unveiled;* or, The Faithful Saviour's Signal to his Hebrew Saints of the impending Days of Vengeance. Deciphered by Thomas Palmer, of Sydney, Australia. London: Elliot Stock.

WE suppose it requires a certain kind of talent to write a book on a subject regarding which the author is ill informed. Mr. Palmer has "Unveiled" the Seals—if we understand anything about them—much in the same way that a London fog unveils the sun.

*The Monograph Gospel.* Being the four Gospels arranged in one continuous narrative in the words of Scripture, without omission of fact or repetition of statement. By G. Washington Moon, F.R.S.L., Member of the Council of the Royal Society of Literature, Author of "The Soul's Inquiries answered in the words of Scripture," etc. London: Hatchards, Piccadilly.

CHAPTERS and verses are omitted in this new Harmony, and the book is divided into sections, of which there are two hundred, each section having a heading characteristic of its subject. There is also an Index showing where the subject of every verse in each of the four Gospels may be found in this work. We thank the learned author for the beautiful little volume on which he has bestowed so much labour of love.

*The Name, Mark, and Number of the Beast.* New Light upon a Dark Theme. A Prostestant Tract for these Catholic Times. By the Rev. Wm. Griffith. London: Elliot Stock.

MR. GRIFFITH'S solution of the famous enigma is ingenious and remarkable. So far as we know it is perfectly original, and secures for the author great honour. A dozen copies of the Tract may be had by sending 1s. 6d. to Mr. Griffith, The

Digitized by Google

Manor, Eastbourne, or a single copy from the publisher for twopence. We should like to hear that it is circulated by thousands, for popery has gained enormously by the abolition of the temporal power, and it is working night and day to add the British Islands to the communion of "the Holy Catholic Church." Every patriot who reads this Protestant tract will say, "*Never!*"

*Mazie's Joy.* By Lizzie Joyce Tomlinson. London: E. Marlborough and Co.

A SIMPLE story, illustrative of domestic love, of a talent well used, and of the providence of God over those who trust Him.

*Lamps and Lighters.* Sunday afternoon half-hour Lectures for the Masses, delivered in Birmingham. By Rev. Charles Leach, F.G.S. London: Richard D. Dickinson.

As our opinion of the propriety of Sunday jocular lectures with ridiculous titles for the purpose of catching the "masses" is not asked, we need not give it. To subject these talks to either a literary or theological test would be absurd. That Mr. Leach is in earnest, and that some reformation was accomplished we doubt not; but why the farrago is published we do not know.

*The Bella and her Crew.* By Harriet S. Hill, author of "The Poacher's Son." London: E. Marlborough and Co.

THIS book is well written. It gives a vivid description of sea-faring life, and sketches the homes and habits of our fishermen with obvious truthfulness. But the close of the story is painfully disappointing, in the case of one whom the reader has learnt to love. Alas! it is often so in real life, and perhaps the author simply describes a fact.

*Heaven not our Home*, but the Renovated Earth the Eternal Abode of the Redeemed Saints. London: Elliot Stock.

THE title of this book comes into collision with the pulpit teaching of Christendom; but the book itself proves the title correct. Why the author of so excellent a treatise conceals his name we do not know. Perhaps he judged that no name can be of any authority in the matter; and he is right. The Bible alone has authority here; and it speaks with unsuspected fulness on the subject, as the volume before us shows. The calm thoughtfulness of the writer, the clearness of his style, and the appositeness of his quotations from Scripture, are among the attractive features of the work, which we hope will have, as it deserves, a host of readers.

## NOTICES.

MR. LAING has issued a Tract on "Preaching to the Spirits in Prison." It is 4s. per 100 or 6d. per dozen. Orders to be sent to W. Laing, 51, Buccleuch Street, Edinburgh.

A CHEAP edition of Mr. White's "Life in Christ" is issued. Four shillings for this work is a small sum; and the issue of an edition of 10,000 copies is a remarkable fact in the book world.

Digitized by Google

THE RAINBOW for 1877, cloth, lettered, 576 pages demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d., is now ready. As a gift to a thoughtful or inquiring friend this book would be acceptable and profitable.

REV. W. T. HOBSON'S reply to Rev. Canon Garbett's papers in the *Christian Observer*, on the Immortality of the Soul, will appear next month.

WE have received two more papers on the question whether the dead are "conscious." That of Mr. Mill, which first reached us, will be published next month, and that of Mr. Hayward in March, when this particular discussion will close. It has not been without profit, as leading to a close examination of Scripture on the subject.

"THE Harmony of Nature" accepted with thanks.

"A WATCHER."—Yes, all the world now rings with the doctrine for which the Editor got the "cold shoulder." He is quite willing to be forgotten if the TRUTH lives; but Universalism is *not* the truth; and recent deniers of eternal torment will be consistent with themselves when they also deny the natural immortality of man—not before. As long as the immortality of the human soul is believed, all is darkness.

"W. J. T."—If you will look at the matter carefully you will probably conclude that "the Lord's day" in Rev. i. 10 does not mean the first day of the week, but "the day of the Lord," the great day of judgment. Our "Sunday" in the New Testament is invariably called the first day of the week. As Paul was caught *away*—not "up"—to see Paradise, so John was by the Spirit privileged to look upon the terrible and glorious things which will result from the return of our Lord to his inheritance, the world. The truth is, the *whole* of the Apocalypse is *future*, including the letters to the seven churches. These churches are "synagogues" (Rev. ii. 9; iii. 9), congregations of the faithful remnant in the latter day.

THE *Mining Journal* says, "The December number of the RAINBOW, a religious magazine, ably edited by the Rev. W. Leask, D.D., has just been issued, completing the fourteenth volume of this successful, useful, interesting, and talented periodical. There is an article by General Goodwyn philosophising upon the dissolution of the world, written in the usual eloquent style of the General. He also describes its predicted replacement by a new heaven and a new earth. There is another able and philosophical article on 'The Heathen World,' designed to show that a measure of divine revelation existed extensively among the ancients before the miserable mythologies of Greece, Rome, and India existed. A concluding paper on 'The Rationale of the Resurrection' is attractive, and another on 'The Triune Nature of Man—Spirit, Soul, and Body,' which is marked by metaphysical acumen. The Rev. Edward White writes on 'Future Punishment.' We call attention to this magazine because it is by far the ablest religious periodical of the day, pervaded by sound philosophy, and wholly unsectarian. The editor, Dr. Leask, is well known as the author of ——— ———, a book which a few years ago, attracted the attention especially of literary men. It was remarkable for an elegant diction, which, indeed, characterises all the learned doctor's writings."

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

FEBRUARY, 1878.

## THE SHAKING OF THE HEAVENS.

IN the article on "The Immovable Kingdom" in the RAINBOW for November, I affirmed that the shaking of the heavens and the earth predicted in the prophecy of Haggai, and quoted in the letter to the Hebrews, must be understood in a literal sense. I gave the reason that in the prophecy referred to political convulsions are mentioned in addition to the physical, and that in a manner which precludes us from understanding the physical in a merely figurative sense to signify the political, as some apply the language in other passages. This literal or physical shaking of the heavens and earth is confirmed by the apostle in quoting the prediction in Hebrews; for he bases his argument on the physical shaking which took place at Sinai at the giving of the law—"whose voice then shook the earth," &c., and quotes Haggai to show that there should be a "shaking, not of the earth only, but also heaven."

To fortify this position still more I make a quotation from the prophecy of Isaiah—"Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner: but my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished." From the language—"lift up your eyes to the heavens," &c., there can be no doubt that this is a prediction of a change of the physical heavens. Of similar import is Psalm cii. 25-28.

I am quite aware that there is some ground for applying the term "heavens" to ruling power, as in Dan. iv. 15—"the heavens do rule," but I do not wish to discuss this question here. I confine myself to the literal sense of the terms heaven and earth. For the same reason I leave out of view 2 Pet. iii. and our Lord's discourse on Mount Olivet, seeing that opinion is divided regarding



Digitized by Google

the sense in which the terms heaven and earth in these passages are to be understood.

In offering a few remarks on the shaking of the heavens I must acknowledge that what I have to say is more suggestive than demonstrative. The reason is that there is less direct testimony regarding it than there is as to the shaking of the earth. I hope some other contributor may be able to supplement or correct whatever may be necessary.

It is well that we should understand what is meant by the term heaven as used in the connection we are considering. While the term is used to denote the place where the Divine presence is specially manifested (the third heaven of the Jews), and the place occupied by the heavenly bodies (the second), it also denotes "the region of the air, dew, clouds, and wind" (the first). This last sense is clearly shown in the Mosaic account of the creation in Gen. i. "God made the firmament (margin *expansion*) and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament. . . . And God called the firmament heaven. . . . And God said, "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." And we read of the "rain of heaven," the "dew of heaven," the "hoary frost of heaven," &c.

These fowls of heaven are thrice termed in this first chapter of Genesis "fowl of the *air*"—thus showing the identity of the "expansion," firmament, or heaven, with the atmosphere. And it is worthy of notice here that the first verse of Genesis is an intimation of the work of the six days, and cannot be applied to any antecedent creation. This is seen from the fact already quoted of the making of the heavens on the second day. And the fact is referred to in unmistakable terms in the fourth commandment of the decalogue—"In *six days* the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is; and rested the seventh day." At the same time an antecedent creation is quite admissible, because the Mosaic record is confined to the order of of things now existing, and is silent as to any previous creation. This silence leaves ample scope for any conclusions of science regarding the age of the earth as a material body. Possibly the second verse is descriptive of the condition of the earth at the time just before the creation described by Moses, that is, prior to the first day. It must also be kept in mind that there is no authority for the term "create" receiving the sense of "making out of nothing" as it generally does. In verse 26 of this chapter it is thrice applied to the production of man, who was made from previously existing materials. See an interesting article under *Bara* in Dr. Samuel Lee's Hebrew Lexicon.

The heaven most closely related to our earth is therefore the "*expansion*," which is none other than what we term the atmo-

Digitized by Google

sphere. It will be admitted that this is the most likely heaven to be subjected to the "shaking" predicted, and we therefore leave out of view the starry heavens and the place of the Divine presence in our consideration of the subject.

The prophecy of Isaiah from which a quotation has already been made is part of a long prophetic poem concerning the complete and final redemption of the nation of Israel by their Messiah. It begins at chapter xl. and continues to the end of Isaiah's writings. Our quotation is taken from a section extending from chapter xlix to liii., in which the work of the Messiah, both as a sufferer and a conqueror, is graphically depicted. In chapter li., from which we have quoted, the final glory of Israel is seen in such statements as these—"Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord." . . . "Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem." And chapter lii. beginning: "Awake, awake, put on thy strength; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city; for henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean."

In this prophecy, and within the brief space of eleven verses (in chapter li.), there are three several occurrences of the terms "heavens and earth." In two of these, including that already quoted, these terms are employed in a sense that is unmistakably literal. Thus, "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath." The second is, "And forgettest the Lord thy Maker, that hath stretched forth the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth." The third occurs three verses farther on, and there seems no reason why it should not also be understood in the same literal sense. It is, "And I have put my words in thy mouth, and have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, Thou *art* my people."

Let us now look at the first and third a little more closely. The first says, "The heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment." Taken by itself, this language would seem as if the consummation of Proserpine in Shakespeare's *Tempest* should be realised, and "leave not a rack behind." But when it is followed in the same prediction by a declaration of Jehovah that he should "plant the heavens and lay the foundations of the earth," and that in connection with his "saying to Zion, Thou art my people," we have presented to us the other side of the question, and are enabled to understand the "vanishing away of the heavens" to be but the first step in a process of regeneration. Let any simple-minded, intelligent student of the Bible read this chapter, and observe the manner in which the terms "heaven and earth" are used in verses six, thirteen, and sixteen, and then let him say whether he can accept the former two in any other than the literal sense, and if so, whether he is not compelled to apply the same rule to the last.



Digitized by Google

The result is, therefore, that at the period of Israel's restoration, either before it or sometime after it, there shall be a Divine interposition in relation to the atmospheric heavens, as well as in relation to the solid earth upon which we dwell. This change we may reasonably infer will be a change for the better. Whether it will be of the nature of a restitution of a condition of the atmosphere which obtained at any former period it may be impossible to say; but I submit that these statements I have quoted, are sufficiently conclusive of the fact of extensive change; while the circumstances of Israel's restoration, and their re-establishment in the Divine favour, warrant the conclusion that improvement and not deterioration shall be the result.

This finds some corroboration in another part of Isaiah's prophecies, which, though predicting the deliverance of Israel from the Assyrian, seems, after the manner of the prophets, to contain allusions to their final glory. It is as follows:—"Moreover the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the LORD bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound." (Isaiah xxx. 26.) This passage is assumed to be figurative by most commentators. Cobbin's note is—"These figures express a large increase of prosperity and joy." But the paragraph in which it occurs is of a very unfigurative character, and when we view it in connection with the "planting of the heavens," as intimated in chapter li. there seems no reason whatever to put a figurative meaning upon it. The paragraph begins (verse 18), "Therefore will the Lord wait that he may be gracious unto you . . . the people shall dwell in Zion at Jerusalem; thou shalt weep no more . . . thine eyes shall see thy teachers. . . . Then shall he give the rain of thy seed, that thou shalt sow the ground withal . . . in that day shall thy cattle feed in large pastures." Then verse 25 reads—"and there shall be upon every high mountain, and upon every high hill, rivers and streams of waters in the day of the great slaughter, when the towers fall;" which is immediately followed by the verse predicting the increased light of the sun and the moon, which comes in quite in keeping with the moral and material blessings predicted in the preceding verses.

This increase of physical light points to a change in the constitution of the atmosphere. What the nature of such a change shall consist in I do not presume to say; but the fact of the predicted "shaking of the heavens," their vanishing away like smoke, and their being planted, (or re-established, as Cobbin remarks, "the sense being that of firmly fixing into the ground the pegs to which the cords of a tent are fastened,") shows that some important change shall take place, and the predicted increase of light is probably one of the results effected by the change.

I would now refer to what may be considered by many of a more

Digitized by Google

speculative character, but which may at the same time tend to throw some light on the change to be effected on the atmosphere.

In the same prophecy we have a very distinct prediction as to the increased longevity of the people of Israel, and probably we may be safe in inferring that the other nations shall participate in the same blessing. Thus :—

"I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people: and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying. There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed. And they shall build houses, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat; for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they are the seed of the blessed of the LORD, and their offspring with them." (Isaiah lxv. 19-23.)

In connection with this we must notice the well known fact that after the flood the duration of human life became, in the course of ten generations, very much shortened. Methuselah, the grandfather of Noah, lived to the age of 969 years. Noah himself lived 950 years; but of this he lived prior to the flood 600 years. Shem, one of the sons of Noah, only reached the age of 600. His descendants are given in the following list, beginning, for the sake of comparison, with Noah :—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Noah | 950 | Serug | 230 |
| Shem | 600 | Nahor | 148 |
| Arphaxad | 438 | Terah | 205 |
| Salah | 433 | Abraham | 175 |
| Eber | 464 | Isaac | 180 |
| Peleg | 239 | Jacob | 147 |
| Reu | 239 | | |

At the age of 175 Abraham is said to have been "an old man and full of years," at 180 Isaac was "old and full of days."

We have no reliable testimony as to the cause of this contraction of the period of human life. The curse which came upon the ground on account of the disobedience of the first human pair, does not appear to have had any appreciable effect in this direction down to the time of the flood; for Methuselah, the grandfather of Noah, lived thirty-nine years longer than Adam.

Is there any circumstance, therefore, which would account for this gradual but certain shortening of human life which took place after the flood?

May it not have been a change for the worse effected in the atmosphere? If we suppose that its humidity was increased at the time of the flood, it would go a far way to account for the contraction of human life. There are several circumstances which favour this

Digitized by Google

hypothesis. The phenomenon of the rainbow was probably a new thing after the flood, and not the mere appointment of a pre-existent phenomenon as a token of the non-repetition of a flood. And we are informed that when the vegetable portion of creation was called into existence "the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth;" . . . "but there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground." Of course the creation of plants was a supernatural act, and was not dependent on the ordinary conditions, such as rain and sunshine, which came into operation afterwards. And the mention of there having been no rain would therefore have little weight in the argument as to the constitution of the atmosphere at the creation. But the mention of "mist" in the absence of rain, and especially when it is said that "the Lord God HAD NOT CAUSED it to rain," seems to point to a different arrangement of things from what now obtains. Why should mist be in existence any more than rain, when neither was absolutely necessary in the circumstances? It is not as if rain had simply not happened to fall; but "God had not caused it to rain," is equivalent to He had not provided the means whereby rain should be produced. The supply of moisture was limited to the "mist," which, by condensation, "watered the whole face of the ground."

I shall quote one more passage of a different character which seems to have an important bearing on this subject. It occurs in Ezekiel's prophecy of the destruction of Gog's army and the future final deliverance of Israel. It is as follows:—"And it shall come to pass at the same time when Gog shall come against the land of Israel, saith the Lord God, that my fury shall come up in my face. For in my jealousy, and in the fire of my wrath, have I spoken, Surely in that day there shall be a great shaking in the land of Israel; so that the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the heaven, and the beasts of the field, and all creeping things that creep upon the earth, and all the men that are upon the face of the earth, shall shake at my presence; and the mountains shall be thrown down, and the steep places shall fall, and every wall shall fall to the ground. And I will call for a sword against him throughout all my mountains, saith the Lord God: every man's sword shall be against his brother. And I will plead against him with pestilence and with blood; and I will rain upon him, and upon his bands, and upon the many people that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hailstones, fire, and brimstone. Thus will I magnify myself, and sanctify myself; and I will be known in the eyes of many nations; and they shall know that I am the Lord." (Ezek. xxxviii. 18-23.)

It will be observed that heaven, earth, and sea are affected by the shaking here predicted. The sea here is probably the Mediterranean, and the shaking, so far as the description given shows, is of a local character. Whether it be only part of a more extensive convulsion, such as is indicated in Isaiah li., I do not presume to

Digitized by Google

say. But there can be no doubt as to the reality of these truly physical phenomena, and that they shall take place at the time of Israel's restoration, and the consequent enlightenment of the nations regarding the God of Israel.

I make no pretension to science in the consideration of this subject: I have simply quoted the language of the sacred writers, and endeavoured to ascertain the sense it will naturally bear in relation to the physical convulsions so plainly predicted by the prophets.

I have attempted to treat this subject by confining myself to a very few Scriptures, which will be acknowledged by all millenarians at least, to be capable of no other sense than the strictly literal. At the same time it appears to me that such passages as Isa. lxv. 17; and 2 Pet. iii. are less likely to have a figurative sense. when the usage of the terms heavens and earth, in Isa. li., is taken into account. There is also a passage in the Revelation (xvi. 18), where the seventh vial poured into the AIR would seem to indicate the probability of a literal sense, so as to be in harmony with the physical shaking of the heavens. But I desire to avoid resting anything on questionable data, and have therefore left out of consideration the passages referred to.

It may not be possible to ascertain the nature and extent of the shaking of the heavens and the earth, or the purpose to be effected by it. The shaking of the earth is certainly connected with the upheaval of a large portion of the land of Israel in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem (see Zech. xiv.), as well as with the cutting a channel for a new river, extending from Jerusalem to the Salt Sea. Whether the shaking of the earth shall extend beyond this or not, it is evident that the shaking of the heavens shall be on a more extended scale; for the heavens are to vanish away, and to be planted again.

But however limited or extended this convulsion may be, its reality cannot be doubted. And just as little can be doubted the reality of that kingdom which cannot be shaken. "It shall stand for ever." "All people and nations and languages shall serve" the divinely appointed King and princes who shall administer it. And although a revolt will be attempted at the close of the thousand years' reign, it will be suppressed at once by fire from heaven. This fire is said to "come down from God out of heaven," showing that the kingdom is really located upon the earth. In the words of the interpreter to Daniel, "the kingdom and dominion UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN." Speaking of those who shall possess this kingdom, and the term of their possession, the same authority says, "The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom FOR EVER, EVEN FOR EVER AND EVER."

This will be the exalted privilege of all who shall be found among the faithful, both of ancient and modern times. "Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." The glad tidings of its

Digitized by Google

approach formed the theme of the preaching of our Lord and his apostles, and became an object of hope to the early church. Let the reader see that their hope becomes his, for so shall he realise the privilege of those who love the Lord's appearing, in receiving the crown of righteousness which shall never fade away.

Edinburgh. J. CAMERON.

---

## "THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY COME TO PASS."

REVELATION i. 1.

No. 2.

*(Continued from November.)*

RETURNING then to our quotation from Rev. xix. 7, "The marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready." This term, "His wife hath made herself ready," seems to us to point to that life, walk, and triumph of faith for which the individual believer is responsible, according to the words just quoted, "Brethren, give diligence," &c. And if so, *readiness* has been the standard of approval in all ages, even that life of faith which "obtained for the elders a good report." (Heb. xi. 2.) Thus Abel, who by faith offered the "more excellent sacrifice;" Enoch, the seventh from Adam, who prophesied, "Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints;" Noah, at once the preacher and heir of the righteousness which is by faith; and Abraham, the father of the faithful of all generations, who, wherever he sojourned, built an altar unto the Lord, and called upon the name of the Lord as a witness to all around (see Gen. xii. 7, 8), these all who lived by faith, and walked with God by faith, and died in the triumph of faith, must surely be of the number who shall comprise the Bride, the Lamb's wife, and enter in with him to the marriage supper.

But Lot and all those who—though righteous men and vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked—have notwithstanding chosen the well-watered plains, pitched their tent toward Sodom, and eventually found in Sodom until well nigh consumed in its overthrow, these must be ashamed before him at his coming, must be saved yet so as by fire, must be as foolish virgins shut out from the marriage supper and therefore in no sense whatever form part of the body and bride of Christ.

And here it may be necessary to define our understanding of the difference between "the *Church which is his body*" (Eph. i. 21, 22), and "the *Church in the wilderness*" (Acts vii. 38), set forth in the New Testament under the several emblems of a body comprising head and members, and a vine comprising root and branches; not two churches, but one, or, as it were, two circles, an outer encom-

Digitized by Google

passing an inner; the former seen by man as "the great house in which there are all manner vessels of gold and of silver, of wood and of earth" (2 Tim. ii. 20); the latter seen by God as "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." (1 Tim. iii. 15.) "The Church, which is his body," we find to be comprised of living members, made such and preserved such by the law of the spirit of life from the Head circulating throughly the inner man, and so freeing them as to their inner life from bondage to the law of sin which wars in their members (Rom. viii. 2). And as to their outward life, walking in separation from the world and worldly church with their fashions and maxims, their pleasures and profits, their pomps and vanities, and especially that covetousness which is idolatry, the love of money which is the root of all evil. These will be found in readiness through sustained communion with God in Christ. These are they who say, "For me to live is Christ," and enduring to the end finally overcome and receive the "full reward" (see 2 John 8). But "the church in the wilderness," as set forth under the emblem of the great house, and the vine and its branches, is found in an outer circle which may yet be divided again and again. For here we have the mixed multitude who go up out of Egypt, assay to cast in their lot with Israel, become baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, but in the day of temptation fall away. These are the vessels of wood and of earth which the fire proves to be combustible, the fruitless branches broken off, gathered by men, cast into the fire, and burned. And here also are the weak in faith, who, like Aaron and Miriam, when Moses is away for forty days, cannot stand up for God, but are carried away by the popular clamour. The like of Nicodemus too, who came to Jesus by night, and the many who believed on him but did not confess him lest they should be put out of the synagogue; disciples, but shrinking from the cross consequent upon a confession of him, are not confessed by him at his appearing. Vessels of silver perhaps, but *not* vessels of gold, such as are found in the inner circle, possessed of that degree of grace which shall constitute them ready ones, purged from fellowship with the vessels of wood and of earth, and so found "vessels unto honour, sanctified and meet for the Master's approval." Under the emblem of the vine and its branches too we find, besides the branches broken off and burnt, branches *less* fruitful, and branches *more* fruitful, some whose fruit is thin and poor and spare, others whose fruit abounds to the praise and glory of the Father, the husbandman.

Here is deep, solemn, and heart-searching truth. When we reflect that some for a time stood fair, looked well, promised fruit in bud and bloom, but bringing forth no fruit to perfection, are likened to the barren fig-tree that was at length cut down as a cumberer of the ground, we may not, must not shelter ourselves under the doctrine of final perseverance, either rocking ourselves or suffering ourselves to be "*rocked in the covenant*"—as it is called

Digitized by Google

in a certain school,—but must take our Lord's words for truth which say, "He that endureth *to the end*, the same shall be saved." Nor forget those who are spoken of as "having been once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost yet fall away, *not* to be renewed again unto repentance." (Heb. vi. 4-6.) Such were Balaam, Saul, and Judas, Alexander the coppersmith, and Demas who loved this present world. These were all in—what we denominate—the *visible* church, "the church in the wilderness" being the called-out-assembly, such as now in our day have "named the name of Christ," are acknowledged among men as Christian, including all the churches, Roman, Greek, Anglican, and Dissenters, all from Mormonites to Plymouth Brethren. God is Judge himself where the line is drawn between the outer and the inner circle, between the ready and the unready for his appearing. The one essential to readiness we account to be *love*. Love to God and love to man, but especially to the household of faith. Love to God in Christ after the order of one espoused to him as to the Bridegroom of the soul, coveting and cultivating intercourse with him in the bride-chamber of the soul, reserving the heart a place for him, clean from idols and clear for him, its door ever open for him, but closed to all other. Love to man, regardless of colour, caste, or creed, as to one made like ourselves in the image of God, and we ever seeking ways and means by which to recover and restore that lost image, believing that the same grace which has restored one may restore yet others, seeing that "God is no respecter of persons." Love to the fellow-believer, too, regardless of his sect or denomination, more ready to esteem others better than themselves. While they judge themselves severely, they judge others hopefully, making small account of their own particular church or sect, but making much account of a sober, righteous, and godly life wherever they meet with it, be it in the Roman, Greek, Protestant, High Church, Low Church, or Dissenting Communions, remembering how it is written, "In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." We conceive it quite possible for the Pope and some of his cardinals, the Archimandrite or some of his patriarchs, not less than some of the bishops of our own State Church, to be answerable to this test of readiness before God in the secret of their heart and closet, independently altogether of the corrupt systems with which they stand associated. God, who searcheth the heart, sees how far they are responsible before him for fidelity to their light, and what that measure of light is. No ecclesiastical association *necessarily* helps or hinders our access to God in secret, seeing that comparatively few are accountable for their ecclesiastical association. Irresponsible as we all are for our natural birth and parentage, so to a great extent are we irresponsible for our church associations. If any man by an accession of light feels called of God to "Come out and be separate" from some discovered evil, woe be to him if

Digitized by Google

he is disobedient to the heavenly vision, but woe to him also if he judge his brother for not following him, and let such an one take heed how he casts a stumbling-block in his brother's way. "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God," but require it not of him to whom it is not given. We understand well that the kingdom of God is not meat or drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Neither the eating of meat, nor the drinking of wine, nor the abstinence from either or both shall commend us to him. Nevertheless we shall find in the life of faith no provision made for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof. That life of faith which makes *much* of Christ makes *little* of creature necessities.

Christ is to us according to our faith—and more; but so much as by faith we are able to grasp of him, so much is he to us experimentally. To the Jew he is Messiah still, and although in his humiliation he knew him not, in his coming glory the Jew shall find in his Messiah his highest and fondest hopes fulfilled. To the sinner wanting salvation, and as yet appprehending nothing more, he is a Saviour, the Christ of God. To the believer translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son, where grace reigns, he is both Lord and Christ; and faith realises him there exalted to be both Prince and Saviour. But to the saint whose surrender to him has become entire and continuous he is all that and more; espoused to him in the Gospel, he is seen and felt to be the soul's very Bridegroom, and where the "first love" is still retained, the language of the soul becomes, "I am my Beloved's and my Beloved is mine. His mouth is most sweet, yea, he is altogether lovely. This is my Beloved and this is my friend, O daughters of Jerusalem." (Song, v. 16.) And when the Bridegroom cometh it shall be seen and known who have been living on these terms with him, and who following him afar off. The thing we are contemplating as shortly to come to pass—the *first* of those things, the rapture—will overtake us suddenly, finding us as we *then are*. Wherefore it behoves us now at once to give heed to the admonition, "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith (i.e., in the life of faith). Know ye not your own selves how that Jesus Christ is in you except ye be reprobates" (that is, without proof, not abiding the proof; see Alford). (2 Cor. xiii. 5). And let us not forget that these were the words of the Apostle, addressed "unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints that are in all Achaia." (2 Cor. i. 1.)

Hackney. N. STARKEY.

*(To be continued.)*

---

Digitized by Google

# CANON GARBETT ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

## I.

CANON GARBETT has a deservedly high reputation in the Church of England, especially among the evangelical party, as a thoughtful, learned, and able theologian. There is no one with whose utterances and sentiments, so far as we know them, we more cordially and thoroughly concur, with the one exception of his utterances and sentiments on the subject of Future Punishment and the Immortality of the Soul.

We refer especially to his three papers in the *Christian Observer* of September, October, and November last, on "the Immortality of the Soul." We do not think they will increase his reputation in any way. We can only think and hope that it will survive them, if he is careful to let the subject of them alone for the future, or else to handle it very differently.

When his first paper appeared we wrote to the editor of the *Christian Observer*, asking room for a reply, which he politely declined. We acknowledge his courtesy. It is quite within the editor's rights of admitting or refusing matter for his magazine. He has exercised his discretion in what seemed to him the best way. We have certainly no right to complain—however, we may regret, as we do, that the opportunity was missed of having the important subject of Canon Garbett's papers thoroughly discussed before such an intelligent audience as the readers of the *Christian Observer*.

We venture now, before another, and certainly no less intelligent, audience, to make the following reply to Canon Garbett. We do so, as we feel, under great disadvantage in entering the lists with such a redoubtable champion. We would be sorry to stand before him on any other subject. We are glad, as we have observed already, to stand beside him, or rather let us say, behind him, on every other. We have no advantage except in the strength of our cause. His weakness—and we believe he is very weak in these papers—is owing altogether to the weakness of the cause he espouses.

Let us clear the ground for debate with a few opening remarks:

1. Is it too much to ask of Canon Garbett and others, that they should abstain from the injustice of imputing to those who hold what is called conditional immortality, the denial of the eternity of punishment? Our blessed Lord, whose words and whose teaching by his inspired apostles and prophets we believe and revere quite as implicitly and as loyally as Canon Garbett, has told us concerning the impenitent wicked in the day of judgment: "These shall go away into everlasting (or eternal) punishment." We believe this implicitly. It is discourtesy, or worse, and shows the weakness of a bad cause, to reiterate that we deny it. We differ from Canon Garbett and

Digitized by Google

others as to the mode of the eternity of the punishment. We believe in the awful truth itself quite as firmly as he does. What we deny is the eternal life of the wicked in hell or elsewhere, or—as there is some question raised about the meaning of the word "life," which we shall notice hereafter, let us say instead—the eternal *existence* of the wicked. We deny eternity of suffering for man. We maintain the distinction between eternal punishment and eternal torment. We hold the one as true and scriptural; we reject the other as unscriptural and untrue. It may be extremely foolish in us to make this distinction. Still that is the point. And the more untenable the distinction, and the more foolish we are to make and maintain it, the easier it ought to be for Canon Garbett and others to make this appear, and to meet us on that point.

2. There is no difference between us and Canon Garbett as to the meaning of the word "eternal," or as to the duration implied in it. Consequently, such a sentence as the following is quite out of place and irrelevant in any discussion between the writer of it and the upholders of Conditional Immortality. "One of the strongest arguments in support of the Scriptural authority of the doctrine of eternal punishment is derived from the admitted belief of the Jews in our Lord's day, and the sense of endless duration which it is undeniable that they attached to the word 'eternal,' and to its equivalents. For if they were wrong, is it conceivable that our Lord would address to them this very self-same word, in the very self-same relation, and yet never warn them that he did not use it in the sense they were accustomed to attach to it? An argument of this kind has been used in the other direction from the classic usage of certain words. But it is stronger beyond all imaginable comparison, when it is applied to the Jewish usage. If the Jews were accustomed to understand the word 'eternal' in one sense, in the sense, namely, of endless duration, and our Lord used it, speaking to these very Jews, in another sense, it is difficult to know by what word, consistent with common reverence to the character of our Lord, such a mode of speaking can be characterised." (*C. O.* pp., 674-5.) All this strength of language has been wasted. Canon Garbett surely knows that, with perhaps one or two insignificant exceptions, Conditionalists, as he calls us, use the word eternal,—at least as applied to future punishment, "in the sense of endless duration." The question is—and this question is not met by him—Is it scriptural to apply the word "eternal" and its equivalents to what is endless in the duration of result as well as to what is endless in the duration of process? We say it is eminently so. We give Scripture after Scripture as instances of it. Let Canon Garbett and others join issue with us on that point. It is scarcely honest to charge us with a difference that does not exist between us. It is surely the more sensible plan to meet us on points on which we differ than on points on which we agree.

Digitized by Google

We might, even in the case of such a writer as Canon Garbett, suppose that such mistakes had occurred from want of information as to our position. But he puts it out of our power to do so by stating on the very same page (675), with his words quoted above: "It is admitted by the Author of *Life in Christ*, the most important publication of the new school, that 'the punishment, of whatever nature, is as eternal as the life.'" This is not only "admitted," it is insisted on, and not only by the able author of that important publication, but by Mr. Minton, Mr. Maude, Dr. Leask, Mr. Heard, Mr. Constable, Mr. Warleigh, Professor Hudson, Mr. Tinling, Mr. Ker, Dr. Petavel, Mr. Hastings, &c., indeed by, so far as we know, all who hold conditional immortality.

That "the punishment of whatever nature is as eternal as the life," is held, we believe, by all but those who believe in the eventual restoration of those who shall be consigned to the everlasting destruction of Gehenna. We are very much mistaken if the position we take in this matter is not the only one from which endless eternity of punishment will, after a while, be maintained by any Protestant Christians.

3. There is another matter which Canon Garbett has quite needlessly introduced into his papers—we mean the question of the soul's existence in the intermediate state between death and resurrection. This has really nothing to do with the controversy, either as to the immortality of the soul or as to eternal torment. It, or something like it, is denied by some who hold with him. It is asserted, we believe, by most who hold conditional immortality and who deny eternity of torment. It is asserted and maintained with most convincing arguments by Mr. White in his "Life in Christ." It is asserted and maintained by Mr. Minton, Mr. Heard, Mr. Maude, Mr. Ker, Mr. Hayward, and a host of others, among whom we may put the present writer.

And yet Canon Garbett has allowed himself to write as follows: "Moreover, on the hypothesis of this school, the wicked absolutely cease to be at death; but at the resurrection they are to be recreated, 'reconstituted,' in order that they may first be tormented and then annihilated" (p. 681). "The identity of the persons raised and judged is logically essential to the very idea of a resurrection and a judgment; indeed it is so undeniable that Conditionalists can only meet the difficulty by the awkward and blundering theory of the reconstitution of the dead" (p. 841). With equal unfairness he speaks thus of Mr. White, and his clear admission "that the souls, not of the righteous alone, but of the wicked also, are kept alive after death:"—"This strange conclusion is forced upon him by the language of 1 Pet. iii. 20, and the impossibility of putting any meaning on them, without the violent supposition to which we are now calling attention" (pp. 844-5). Mr. White, and those we have mentioned above, believe and teach that all souls are kept alive between death and resurrection quite as cordially, and under

Digitized by Google

as little force from any one passage of Scripture, as Canon Garbett does. We may mention that a large proportion of the Canon's three papers is devoted to proving this that most Conditionalists do not deny but maintain with much greater force of argument than he has brought to bear on it: a much easier task, no doubt, than that he had set before himself of proving, and proving from Scripture, what all Conditionalists most strenuously deny—the essential immortality of the soul.

4. We must say a word on the subject of the "extravagancies of thought which may have been superadded to the Catholic faith" on the subject of eternal torment, by which Canon Garbett pleads that "the question," we suppose, of the immortality of the soul "must not be prejudiced" (p. 677). We see no reason why it should not be put and kept fully before our minds what is—we will not say merely the Catholic faith—but the truth of Scripture on this subject, *if* "the immortality of the soul" is a revealed truth. Without insisting, as most exponents of "the Catholic faith" have done, on material fire being revealed as the instrument of the everlasting destruction of the wicked, we must hold Canon Garbett to this at least:—That the torment which he supposes will be endless, will be either that of material fire or what for horror and anguish unspeakable has been described by our blessed Lord under that awful figure. That it will be that for the least guilty as well as for the most guilty. For all "whose names were not found written in the Lamb's book of life" were cast into the lake of fire; and, according to Canon Garbett, they are to live—no, to exist—and be tormented in that lake of fire—or in a state truly so described—to all eternity. And all who have shown no love, as well as those who have shown most hate to Christ, are to depart into that everlasting fire, and, as Canon Garbett supposes, to exist in it—whatever it actually is—for ever. "No fanatical excesses of language of which men may have been guilty," none of the "many, false, foolish, and monstrous things" which he alludes to as said "in the heat of the preacher's rhetoric or, as the outcome of an unbridled and licentious imagination"—none of the "sensational horrors of hell," which Roman Catholic preachers, sculptors, or painters have portrayed for us can exceed the horrors of an eternal existence for sentient human beings in a lake of fire, or in some state which, without exaggeration, but with Divine and Christian truth, has been so described by the Spirit of Christ. And this, as the plainly revealed truth of Scripture and judgment of God, for God only knows how many millions of the human race, is forced on believers in the Bible by the added belief in "the immortality of the soul."

It is important to see that this is admitted by Canon Garbett and others—we mean this inseparable connection between eternal torment and the immortality of the soul. After reasoning, in a way in which we cannot quite follow him, from Mark ix. 44, 46,

Digitized by Google

as in his opinion a most powerful passage in favour of eternity of torment, the Canon concludes:—"The punishment of the individual will therefore continue as long as the individual continues. From this conclusion there is no escaping." We have no wish to escape from it. It is exactly what we hold as the truth of God plainly revealed in many a passage of Scripture. And we agree with him also when he says shortly after—"It is impossible to get rid of the doctrine of eternal punishment"—he means, "eternal torment"—"unless by denying the immortality of the soul." By all this he evidently means that the doctrine of eternal torment *can* be got rid of by the denial of the immortality of the soul, if that denial can be maintained. So, also, the reviewer of Dr. Leask's "Scripture Doctrine of a Future Life," in the very same number of the *Christian Observer* (p. 723), speaks of "the two true Catholic doctrines, which must ever stand or fall together—the eternity of punishment"—he means, "of *torment*"—"and the immortality of the human soul." These are, as seems to us, distinct admissions that the doctrine of the eternity of torment does not stand at all firmly on those Scriptures which plainly teach eternity of punishment, and that if the immortality of the human soul cannot be sustained as true, the eternity of torment must fall to the ground.

So that it is getting to be evident to all, that the immortality of the soul is *the* question in this whole matter of controversy about eternal torment between us and men of Canon Garbett's school of thought. When that question is settled either way, we will be able to direct our united forces against those who, believing in the immortality of the soul, deny the endless eternity of punishment by asserting that those consigned to it will be restored to holiness and happiness—after being "destroyed for ever."

5. Before we proceed to consider what Canon Garbett advances as proof from Scripture that the human soul is immortal, whether united to Christ for eternal life or not, we would notice two other remarks of his to which we take exception as unfair and irrelevant. He says (p. 676) of "the doctrine of conditional immortality," that "it is avowedly an attempt to get rid of the severe side of the Divine justice." This is doubly wrong. It is neither "avowed" as such an effort by any writer on our side; nor has it either that tendency or that effect.

Canon Garbett himself does not think it has. On p. 679 he says that, "to an amiable sentimentality the doctrine held by the advocates of conditional immortality is fully as shocking, and as replete with horror, as the doctrine of eternal punishment"—he means "eternal torment"—"itself." While putting himself somewhat in advance of these amiable sentimentalists, he adds, "To our belief it is worse, and far more difficult to reconcile with the love of God." So that clearly he does not think it a successful "effort to get rid of the severe side of the Divine justice," even if he were justified in saying that it is "avowedly" such an effort

Digitized by Google

at all. So far from that—to his mind, it increases that severity by adding elements of shockingness and horror, which, strangely enough, the ordinary view of eternal existence in the torment of a lake of fire does not seem to him to possess.

We are reminded of the utterances of Mr. James Grant in his "Religious Tendencies of the Times." On p. xviii. of his preface to the first edition he writes: "Mr. Minton's views of that doctrine"—which are just the views held by Conditionalists in general—"are the most awful, and let me add, the most repulsive, of any form of which the doctrine of destruction has even yet been presented to the human mind."—"I cannot bring myself to think of such a belief without a revulsion of mind which no language I could employ could adequately express" (p. xix.). And yet on page 219 of the same volume he quotes and writes as follows:—"The following passage from the preface of Dr. Watts, to his volume, 'The World to Come': '*If* the blessed God should at any time, in a consistence with his glory and incomprehensible perfections release those wretched creatures from their acute pain and long imprisonment in hell, either with a design of the utter destruction of their being by annihilation, or to put them into some unknown world, upon a new foot of trial, I think I ought cheerfully and joyfully to accept this appointment of God,' *and who would not?* 'for the good of millions of my fellow creatures, and add my joys and praises to all the songs and triumphs of the heavenly world in the day of such a divine and glorious release of these prisoners.' I have italicised the first word of this passage." And we have italicised Mr. Grant's own words, "and who would not?" And we ask our readers to ponder them in the connection in which they stand with the amiable sentiments of the pious Dr. Watts, and also in connection with his (Mr. G.'s) words quoted from his preface above.

Our doctrine is avowedly an effort to let the severe side of the Divine justice stand forth in all the terrible proportions in which it was exhibited in "the faith once delivered to the saints," and without any of the monstrous and incredible additions to it by the doctrines of men—especially by the false philosophy of the immortality of the soul.

In preference to either Canon Garbett's or Mr. Grant's strange and contradictory utterances, we quote the verdict of Bishop Jeremy Taylor about the very same doctrine as held, in his opinion, by Irenæus and Justin Martyr, that it is "so severe and yet so moderated." Though the Bishop does not seem to have fully embraced their doctrine, he evidently thought it probably true and less objectionable than either eternal torment or universalism. "Concerning this doctrine of theirs, so severe and yet so moderated, there is less to be objected than against the supposed fancy of Origen; for it is a strange consideration to suppose an eternal torment to those to whom it was never threatened, to those who never heard of Christ. . . .



Digitized by Google

It is certain that God's mercies are infinite, and it is also certain that the matter of eternal torments cannot be truly understood; and when the schoolmen go about to reconcile the Divine justice to that severity and consider why God punishes eternally a temporal sin, or a state of evil, they speak variously, and uncertainly, and unsatisfyingly." We need hardly say that neither he nor Dr. Watts, whose words we quoted before, believed in the natural immortality of man or his soul. Jeremy Taylor, elsewhere, expressly denied it, and Dr. Watts held the annihilation in death of the infants of ungodly parents.

6. The other remark we must notice as being eminently unfair on the part of Canon Garbett is one we find on pp. 680–1, "Eternal punishment is declared," he says, "to be irreconcilable with the goodness of God, and therefore *it is concluded that men who believe in it cannot feel love for God.*" The latter part of this sentence, which we have italicised, is simply untrue. We challenge Canon Garbett to the proof of it in the case of a single writer on our side of the question, even as regards "eternal torment," though the statement is made concerning the scriptural truth of eternal punishment, and as the generally received opinion among those who hold conditional immortality. And he has thought it worth his while to argue and scold and plead against this phantom of his own creating through nearly a page of the *Christian Observer*. Eternal torment we consider, with Jeremy Taylor as above quoted, to be irreconcilable with the justice of God, not to speak of his goodness and love. At the same time we never doubted, and no one on our side, so far as we have ever heard or read, has ever doubted, that many who do nevertheless believe in eternal torment do love God sincerely. We believe the same of Canon Garbett himself. We loved God ourselves when we believed in eternal torment as we once did, and as we would have done to this day had we not seen plainly that the immortality of the soul—with which eternal torment, to our mind, as well as Canon Garbett's, stands or falls—is a baseless untruth.

It is quite possible that Canon Garbett may have seen the doctrine of eternal torment "asserted to be irreconcilable with the love of God," i.e., with the love of God as revealed in Christ and his Gospel. But as he understands and uses those words of "love *to* God"—for he adds, "yet somehow or other, men have loved God nevertheless"—it is simply untrue that any such assertion is made. How a writer like Canon Garbett could allow himself to make such statements is, we confess, a painful puzzle to our mind. We gladly leave it, having, as in plainest duty bound, given the statements our emphatic contradiction.

W. T. Hobson.

*(To be continued.)*

Digitized by Google

# THE JEWELS AND THE PROPERTY.

"For now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face: now I know in part, but then shall I know even as I am known. And now abideth faith, hope, charity; these three; but the greatest of these is charity."—1 Cor. xiii. 12, 13.

PROPHECIES and tongues were to cease, and knowledge to vanish away, but love would never fail. It was possible to speak with tongues of angels, to resolve deep mysteries, even to remove old mountains, and yet not to have that love divine from which the spices blow. How transcendent in beauty celestial that holy thing which suffers long and is kind. "Love envieth not, love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, does not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth. Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." The 12th chapter of this Epistle contains a wonderful account of ancient supernatural worship, in the overflowing wealth and fulness of a creative epoch. They sang, and prayed, and prophesied under miraculous afflatus. The inspiration descended from above, and the worship ascended to its unseen fountain-head. No liturgy or litanies elaborated by the intellect and the devout heart, but God's Holy Spirit blew the divine music through the human organ pipes, and shook the harp-strings of the mortal, until there was solemn gladness or triumphant rapture. Well, the ninefold gifts are certainly gone, though we may fail in assigning any satisfactory reasons for their cessation. It is possible that the miraculous gifts were mere temporary scaffolding for the erection of the stately Christian edifice. If this will not suffice, then we may say that the beautiful woman in her splendid attire grew vain, haughty, and arrogant; and God stripped her of her misused jewels. But a great lady may lose all her jewels, and yet her estates remain inviolate. The jewels are gone, but the property remains. "And now abideth faith, hope, love; these three, but the greatest of these is love."

We have seen a theory to this effect,—that the gifts were to remain until the will of God was thoroughly made known in a completed authoritative canon, and that when such object was secured that perfect state of things arrived which Paul anticipated, —in noble manhood and clear vision. This theory, however, will hold no water, and is manifestly inadequate. The gifts have long been gone, and the canon has long been completed, but we do not yet stand face to face with absolute reality. We are still children who can see but a little way, and stammer in telling what we see. Our knowledge is partial and our utterance is broken. The truth is, we are still in that condition of childhood portrayed by the Apostle, and see but in a glass darkly,—the imperfect mirror of the ancients must always be borne in mind,—and besides seeing truth



Digitized by Google

dimly, we see many things in the glass which it were well we had never seen; we conceive as children and articulate as children, but nevertheless we believe in a time when we shall see clearly and speak distinctly. In the age of ripe manhood, standing face to face with radiant truth and divinest reality we shall know even as we are known. We walk by lamp-light in a dusky place waiting for the supreme sunrise,—the golden splendour of a day which begins with glory.

Our old divines have given us many weighty sayings, but some of them were only smart and epigrammatic without any depth or cogency. One of the latter kind had reference to the passage before us. "Faith shall be lost in sight, and hope in full fruition, but love shall be eternal." To this we make answer, in the first place, that faith and hope are in the essential structure and belong to the very constitution of man. If we were on the shore where all the nobles of a greater age gather in immortal beauty and regal power; if we were in the City of God where no outside luminary is needed, but all the surpassing light flows direct from his own face, there would still be something to hope for, and something to believe; testimonies to be received by credence, and glories to be looked forward to with desire and expectation. Man is a progressive being, and who can set a limit to his advancement? Certain it is at any rate, that while he advances, climbing one eminence after another in the sublime country, faith and hope must be his companions on the road.

But we answer in the second place,—that the saying is very loosely tacked to the apostolic statement. The apostle is not saying, "there are three sisters; two of them mortal and perishing, and one of them immortal and unfading;" he is teaching something the direct contrary. He is teaching that there are three sisters in one holy family; all eternal; all abiding. They all have the force of eternity in them, and the bloom of immortality upon them; but the youngest is transcendent in grace and beauty,—the greatest and fairest of the three. Faith blossoms into hope, hope ripens into love, and love is the perfect fruit in the Paradise of God. "Now abideth faith, hope, love." Some one might perhaps say, "If love be the perfect fruit, are not the two former graces in some sense superseded and lost?" To which we reply,—there might be something in that if we only looked for one harvest and vintage. But we want the golden grain and the purple grapes while the ages roll on, and therefore the process remains eternal. The sisters are all of the divine and they abide for ever and ever. When impostors frame theories of ethics and religion, they betray themselves by outraging the philosophy of mind and life, and the scientific laws and conditions of our common humanity.

God who built the structure has provided us with a religion in strict correspondence with our nature; and Christ received into the heart brings with him solemn harmony. We *must* believe: even

Digitized by Google

men of the world have to live by faith in the life which borders upon death. As thought is the working power of the understanding, so faith is the working power of life. The men who dream of living by reason are the most absurd of creatures, for such a thing is utterly impossible. Each man—profane or holy—has his theory of life, and his purpose in life; and his spirit goes forth towards his ideal, and his soul cleaves to the things which are desired. Find out what a man is pursuing, get the direction in which he is drifting or driving, and you discover what his faith really is. Without faith none of us can live, the wheels of life would stand still, and the business of the world stagnate, if we did not receive the testimony of each other, and with a still deeper faith every man pursue his own ideal.

God who knows the principles of action with which he has provided us, gave us something glorious to believe, and made the evidence commanding. "It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." "We are not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

To speak for a moment of Christ rather than of Christianity,—we may say that in the majesty and range of his power, in the wisdom and penetration of his doctrine, in the sanctity and radiance of his life, such a being was far beyond the conception of our race. His voice is the voice of a God who utters authentic tidings, and he opens immortal wings for our shelter and pavilion. He brings the everlasting kingdom near to us, and supplies the education and training for rank and dominion in his house and his court.

We must live by *faith*; the difference being simply this,—that those who trust in the flesh and in the world are perishing along with their idols; whereas faith in the Son of God replenishes with life eternal, and the city of God is open to receive the living.

We cannot do without *hope*. It is a wondrous charm, idealising and transforming common things. No man can live entirely in the present,—the artisan, the sailor, the merchant,—all who fight with forces of land or sea, are painting some ideal shore where they may anchor and be done with strife and toil and tumult. God has given us something to hope for. Christian hope lays hold upon the sure promise, confirmed by divine oath, that by these two immutable things we might have strong consolation. Our citizenship is in heaven from whence we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, to change the body of our humiliation, and fashion it like unto his own glorious body, according to the energy of his working. The sublime translation, the City of God, the perfect rest, the eternal communion, the stainless glory, the vision of God, no language may portray.

The men of this world, though they could not live their own distempered life even without hope of some kind, have no hope beyond the present shores; for the future is to them but darkness without

Digitized by Google

moon or star. They neither know where they start from nor whither they are going; their scheme has neither beginning nor consummation. We, on the contrary, have a defined terminus, a goal where all things good and fair shine forth in perfect development, and in glory beyond the colours of the imagination.

We cannot live without *love*. The most brutal would be shocked or offended if we were to say, "Did you ever love any one? did your eyes ever grow brighter, or your face kindle, when you saw the face or heard the footstep of some dear one?" Sad and dreary as things are, how much worse the world would be were the light of love not shining even in very dark places, where the holiest light has never penetrated, but nature remains raw and void.

Now God has given us such a revelation of the fulness and infinity of his love in the person and work of his dear Son, that our hearts are turned to God in Christ with ineffable desire. "We love him because he first loved us;" and because he is worthy of all worship and adoration. We remember the beautiful invocation: "O daughter . . . forget thine own people and thy father's house, so shall the king greatly desire thy beauty, for he is thy Lord and worship thou him." Hence we try to forget our own people in the flesh, and that house of fallen nature from which we were rescued by distinguishing love, that the King may have desire and pleasure in our spiritual beauty, and that all our worship may be given unto him.

Without disparaging the first-born sister, we may certainly say that she is masculine, goes along with grand solid steps, and will admit of no trifling. Unbelief is drunken and wavering, reels and staggers, but faith has the firmness of a rock. Her voice is, "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Whether fighting the enemy in active valour, or enduring wrath passively, or soaring to the throne eternal, she always has confidence and boldness. She obtains promises, stops the mouths of lions, works righteousness, inherits a kingdom, and rises within the veil.

Hope is more etherial—if not so comprehensive—for unlike faith she cannot look backward. She has no eyes behind, but looks steadily forward—with eyes brighter than the morning star—to the supreme splendour of the great gathering; and sees in the centre the object of all high and holy desire,—even him who is "fairer than ten thousand and altogether lovely." Her lamp is of purple, and her wings of unconquerable strength are of blended colours finer than the trailing sunlight in western skies. And the grace and lustre are combined with invincible force. There is the assurance of hope,—it is an anchor of the soul sure and steadfast. There is a sea much wider than the great deep of the natural world, and where the tragedies are still more awful. We all have to do business therein, and find by experience the bitterness of its

Digitized by Google

salt wave, and the force of its tempest. Truly we need an anchor that is "sure and steadfast," and we have one in divine hope. The wind may blow vehemently, and the waters rise proudly, but this anchor will hold the vessel.

*Love*, the generous and Godlike, the greatest of the three, is the very element and atmosphere of life in the Son of God; of life in the power of the Spirit. Though in perfect harmony with her sisters, she can find considerable rest and enjoyment even in the present. Her rosy warmth and perfume are spread over all things, veiling or transforming; she covers a multitude of sins, and awakens springs of life even in the wilderness. Love is the perfect fruit in the supernatural country to which we belong; in its exercise we discover that we have passed from death unto life; and we lay hold, in measure, of the perfection of that God and Father who spreads impartial sunshine over good and evil, and sends his rain upon the just and the unjust.

Nor is the beautiful one shrinking, for she is bold even in the day of judgment. When convulsion rends the rocks asunder, and disparts the old mountains; when natural and supernatural terrors abound; when thrones disappear and the nations tremble, the perfect love which casteth out fear shall give us quietness and assurance for ever.

* G. GREENWELL.

---

## MY BIRTHDAY.

BENEATH the moonlight and the snow
Lies dead my latest year,
The winter winds are wailing low
Its dirges in my ear.

I grieve not with the moaning wind
As if a loss befell;
Before me, oven as behind,
God is, and all is well!

His light shines on me from above,
His low voice speaks within—
The patience of immortal love
Outwearing mortal sin.

Not mindless of the growing years,
Of care and loss and pain,
My eyes are wet with thankful tears
For blessings which remain.

If dim the gold of life has grown,
I will not count it dross,
Nor turn from treasures still my own
To sigh for lack and loss.

Digitized by Google

The years no charm from nature take;
As sweet her voices call,
As beautiful her mornings break,
As fair her evenings fall.

Love watches o'er my quiet ways
Kind voices speak my name,
And lips that find it hard to praise
Are slow at least to blame.

How softly ebb the tides of will!
How fields once lost or won,
Now lie behind me green and still
Beneath a level sun.

How hushed the hiss of party hate,
The clamour of the throng!
How old harsh voices of debate
Flow into rhythmic song!

Methinks the spirit's temper grows
Too soft in this still air,
Somewhat the restful heart forgoes
Of needed watch and prayer.

The bark by tempest vainly tossed
May founder in the calm,
And he who braved the polar frost
Faint by the isles of balm.

Better than self-indulgent years,
The outflung heart of youth;
Than pleasant song in idle ears,
The tumult of the truth.

Rest for the weary hands is good,
And love for hearts that pine,
But let the manly habitude
Of upright souls be mine.

Let winds that blow from heaven refresh,
Dear Lord, the languid air;
And let the weakness of the flesh
Thy strength of spirit share.

And, if the eye must fail of light,
The ear forget to hear,
Make clearer still the spirit's sight,
More fine the inward ear!

Be near me in my hours of need
To soothe, or cheer, or warn,
And down these slopes of sunset lead,
As up the hills of morn!

* J. G. WHITTIER.

Digitized by Google

## DEATH THE ENTIRE EXTINCTION OF LIFE.

THE variety of passages cited in support of soul-life in death seems to to be on a par with the variety of positions assumed regarding the dead. Mr. Hayward says, "I do believe in the death of man when he first dies; but I am sure that death does not extend to the soul of man; and the soul I hold to be the central self of man." Is it a consistent faith to hold a man to be dead, and yet believe the man in his central self to be alive? Again, he says, "I have not contemplated the soul asleep in death as knowing anything." And yet he assures us that the happiness of souls asleep in death will lie, not in the reception yet, but in the anticipation of reward." Then in that case they must "know" of the reward awaiting them, and also the grounds on which it is anticipated. But while holding the soul to be the "central self of man," and at the same time recognising the distinction between soul and spirit, we are nevertheless told that the spirit is a "real, living, part-personal entity," and that it is "only the man who was formed of dust before he received the breath of life that returns to the dust," and that the "disembodied man is a man renewed in spirit." Yet, notwithstanding all this, Mr. Hayward feels aggrieved when it is hinted that this theory makes two men out of one. True, it is ultimately explained that "he does not believe in the separation of what survives of man at death; but that he believes in the continued junction of soul and spirit." This, however, does not help the matter: for still we have one man consigned to dust, and the "disembodied man" existing in conscious happiness somewhere; but where, it would not be easy to determine; for while "the spirit returns to God," it is held that there is "clear proof of the soul's sojourn in hades." But how the "continued junction of soul and spirit" is preserved while the one is in heaven and the other in hades is not explained. Neither has it been explained how "belief in the death of man" is consistent with holding that only "incomparably the meanest of the three essential elements of his being dies." This seems to be converting the serpent's lie into much more of truth than falsehood; but what shall be said of its bearing upon that truth which the serpent's lie controverted? When God said, "Thou shalt surely die," did he mean that only "incomparably the meanest of the three distinct elements of his being should die?" He who can believe it may believe it.

It is significant how much this theory of soul-life is dependent for its support upon the obscure and figurative portions of Scripture. It is among these that it lives, and moves, and has its being. Take away these and how little is left to give it even seeming countenance. Rev. vi. 9, 11 is adduced as supplying important evidence, when on the opening of the fifth seal John saw the souls of the slain under the altar, and heard them crying, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth." This is given in the "hope that it will meet every requirement." Were there in reality any souls there, when John saw visions which he describes? Had those represented either lived, or been slain *then?* Although "souls of them that were slain" are spoken of as "living" beings, may we not, without doing any violence to the passage, fairly understand it in the same light as "The blood of Abel crying unto God from the ground,"

Digitized by Google

and similar passages? Nothing is more common in Scripture than to represent things without life, as if endowed with life, and as having both a heart to feel and a tongue to speak. Thus, "The stone will cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber will answer:" the "dead in sheol (the grave) are stirred up to taunt the king of Babylon, because of his fall from the throne of power to be with them in the pit, with the worms over them and under them;" and even "the firs and cedars of Lebanon rejoice, saying, 'Since thou art laid down, no feller is come up against us.'" (Isa. xiv.) But not to travel so far from the passage on hand, what will be said of the representation on the opening of the seal previous to that in which the souls appear? In the verse immediately preceding those that speak of the souls, "Death is seen riding on horseback, and hell (hades) following with him." Will we be asked to believe that death and hades are also "living beings?" The representation of life is no less vivid. But the whole, we have no doubt, was but a representation in vision of some who, at a certain period of the world's history, on account of their faithful testimony, should be killed, and are represented as crying to be avenged on their murderers still dwelling on the earth. And although spoken of as "the souls of them that were slain," they seem obviously to represent the slain ones, for they cry, "Avenge our blood!" and, receiving white robes, they are told to rest a little season till their brethren should be "killed as *they*"—the *souls*—had been. And when their short season of rest is past they are again seen in chap. xx. 4. And "they lived," (clearly implying previous death,) "and reigned with Christ." Soul is frequently used to denote the person, even when spoken of as apart from, or only belonging to the person, as in the parable spoken by our Lord, "I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry." (Luke xii. 19.) And if Rev. vi. 9, 11 proves that "these dead" know anything, it is things that *are* passing on the earth, for it is to that their cry has relation. "Avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth." They were not the slain of a former generation, their murderers being still alive at the time of the cry.

It is no longer contended that "rest" necessarily implies conscious life; but that it depends upon the nature of the subject. This is well. In fact, the position is perfectly untenable. But even the nature of the subject, I venture to think, will not always determine whether "rest" implies consciousness. The disciples thought our Lord spoke of "Lazarus taking rest in sleep," and said, "If he sleep he shall do well," or recover. A fine corroboration, by the way, of my former remarks on sleep. For in sleep there is rest and refreshment: but profound sleep admits not of the living sleeper being conscious of rest or refreshing until he is awakened. But Mr. Hayward seems to think that there can be no cessation of consciousness for the dead during their death-sleep. While, on the contrary, I hold that no dead person can be conscious of rest in death. Death is the extinction of life, and where there is no life there can be no consciousness. There are special circumstances, however, which may make "rest" in death preferable to life. During hopeless misery in life, the "bitter in soul," like Job, may "rejoice exceedingly and be glad when they find the grave," where "the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at *rest*." But who would ever think of

Digitized by Google

arguing from such a "special case" that "rest" in the grave is "universally" preferable to life? Apply these remarks to what is said of "the dead" in Rev. xiv. 13, of which so much has been made. The relentless persecutions to which they were subjected, are described in chap. xiii., and their dying as martyrs suggests a reason why they are specially pronounced "blessed" in death. Yet I have not the shadow of a doubt, but that *while* "*dead*," the "rest" of their persecutors would be as undisturbed as the "rest" of the persecuted. And "rest" comprises all the blessedness assigned them in this passage, although much more is clearly implied if not expressed. But what is further implied belongs, not to the period during which "death-rest" continues, but to that which either goes before or follows after. "My flesh shall rest in hope" is explained to mean "when in the act of dying." Is it not remarkable that it has never occurred to Mr. Hayward that Rev. xiv. 18 is far more susceptible of such an interpretation? The very language employed is expressive of the act of dying. "Happy the dead who in [the] Lord *are dying* from henceforth." And this is the rendering which is preferred. Now, literally, "the *dead*," "the actually dead," cannot be dying in the Lord from henceforth. This is admitted. What then is the natural conclusion as to the meaning of this passage? Are we not warranted in believing that here, as elsewhere, "the dead," as a designation applied to a class, is not of necessity to be understood as only applicable to that class, while they are "actually dead," but may extend either to the previous act of dying, or to their subsequent resurrection, or to both. The passage before us obviously includes both. To the church in Smyrna it was written, "I know thy works and tribulation; fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer. Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee a crown of life." (Rev. ii. 9, 10.) Those in chap. xiv. had, in great tribulation, been "faithful unto death." No mark of the beast is found either in their "right hand or on their forehead." "Here is the patience and the faith of the saints." Their "names are in the Lamb's Book of Life;" hence they are truly "blessed," blessed with triumphant faith and hope in "dying," with "*rest*" in death, and "a crown of life" in resurrection; for "their works do follow with them:" "not to be buried in their graves," as Mr. Hayward well remarks. No; "for God is not unrighteous to forget their work and labour of love;" but neither, as we believe, "conducing to their conscious happiness in the intermediate state," as contended. Mr. Hayward has entirely failed to give us a single text of Scripture that describes, or even *names* his "intermediate state." Can no such passage be found? Scripture testifies plainly of "the dead" "coming forth from the grave;" of the "sea giving up the dead that are in it;" and "death and hades delivering up the dead that are in them;" and of the dead thus delivered up being "judged according to their works." Thus "their works follow with them" to resurrection and judgment. But "the grave," "the sea," "death and hades," have nothing but "*the dead*" to deliver up. Not a word have we of any other "intermediate state" or any delivering up of souls, living or dead, conscious or unconscious. Scripture is wholly silent about "the soul of man, that central essence of his being, coming forth at the call of the mighty Resurrector." Equally silent is Scripture about the *dead* being,

Digitized by Google

either in whole or in part, rewarded for their works until resurrection and judgment.

To merely negative the argument based upon Rev. xiv. 13 very few words might have sufficed; for "the dead" cannot be a designation for souls living in "conscious happiness;" so that Mr. Hayward has in reality no case here. But it is very desirable that passages advanced as proof against our position, should not only be negatived, but shown to be in agreement with what we contend for. And if this can be done by merely applying the same principles of interpretation as are applied to other passages by those who oppose, it is all the more satisfactory. The argument here is based upon two words—"blessed" and "rest"—as applied to the dead. The passages already given, both from Scripture and other sources, are conclusive against predicating "conscious living existence" upon the mere condition of "*rest*." And if "the nature of the subject" spoken of, is to determine where "rest" implies life, no subject more unfavourable to the idea of life could be chosen than "the dead." And provided we knew as little of flesh, as we do of soul, I venture to think that Acts ii. 26, "My flesh shall rest in hope," might be held to imply "conscious life," with, at least as much plausibility as this, or any other passage that has been given, or can be given, could be held to imply conscious life for the soul in death. Had it been written, "My soul shall rest in hope, because thou wilt not leave my flesh in hades," would we have been allowed to assume that it meant "when in the act of dying?" And, moreover, "flesh-rest" is not an ordinary feature to be witnessed when one is in the act of dying.

Mr. Hayward declines to tell us whether he applies the same principle of interpretation to "the dead" in Rev. xx. 12 as he applies to chap. xiv. 13; but the reason assigned is scarcely a satisfactory one. For whether "the dead," seen to "stand before God," "come forth to the resurrection of life," or to a "resurrection of condemnation;" the simple question is, are we to understand the passage to teach that they are judged while they are "actually dead?" A "frank interpretation" would have been more satisfactory than merely hinting that "a literal and consistent interpretation" can be given.

Having far greater confidence in conclusions based upon a judicious regard to context and kindred passages than when built upon any merely verbal criticisms, however valuable these may be, reference was made to the parallels in Matthew, Mark, and Luke as illustrating more fully the meaning of John xii. 25. But that I either imagined that the passage in John is controverted by these parallels, or that they were referred to for such a purpose, could not for a moment be supposed by any unbiassed, candid reader. And surely no one will contend that our Lord's meaning is fully expressed in John xii. 25, "He that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal." For if so, then the suicide might be regarded as specially filling up the condition of "hating his life in this world;" and hatred of life is the only condition here expressed. Indeed, each of the passages requires the aid of the others for its full meaning, and scarcely even then is it fully stated. In Matthew, Mark, and Luke, "He that loseth his life for my sake," is equivalent to, "He that hateth his life in this world," in John; while, as the consequence of losing life for Christ's sake, we have, "He shall keep it unto life eternal," in John

Digitized by Google

xii. 25; "shall find it," in Matt. x. 39, xvi. 25; "shall save it," in Mark viii. 35 and Luke ix. 24; and "preserve it," in Luke xvii. 33. But why the word "save," in Mark, should determine the sense of "find" in Matthew, may not be easily guessed. All the four but record, in slightly varied form, the utterances of the one Lord; and "find" being unquestionably the true contrast to "lose,"—which both use,—is it not as likely that "find" should determine the sense of "save?" And to read the passage as suggested, "He that loseth his life for my sake shall find that he has it," looks exceedingly forced and unnatural. The man who lost one of a hundred sheep did not find that he "had it" until he sought and found it. But in "finding" it he "saved" it; yea, he "preserved" it. And, had it not been for existing theories, I presume that neither dispute nor difficulty would ever have arisen about these passages. The form of expression is very much akin to the epitaph of a charitable man, which so much pleased the celebrated Addison. "What I spent, I lost; what I possessed is left to others; what I *gave away remains with me.*" But, divested of all ambiguity, what, according to Mr. Hayward's theory, can these words of our Lord, as recorded, possibly mean? Is there no loss of life in the case at all? Neither in the case of him who "seeks to save his life;" nor in the case of those who are said to "lose their life?" Are not the contrasts sufficiently evident? Scripture tells us of the "life that now is, and that which is to come,"—of *this* world, and *that* world, or "the world to come;" and those that attain to "that world die no more." But why Luke xvii. 33 should be counted worthy of more special attention, because the word "preserve" is used, I cannot conceive, seeing it is admitted that it "expresses precisely the same truth as John xii. 25," and it might be added, so do all the others. Alford renders the word, not merely, "shall quicken it;" but, "shall quicken it into life;" which is truly "more than not to let die;" for it is to "quicken into life" that which is dead. To "give it a living birth"—as by Rotherham—is of the same import. And when does this "quickening into life" take place? Ask the context from verse 30, and it answers, "In the day when the Son of Man is revealed!" Yes! The very time "when Christ, who is our life, appears." But I hope it will not be argued that the man who "loses his life for Christ's sake," when dead "requickens himself," although the language employed would seem to imply this as clearly as John x. 18 seems to imply it of our Lord. And it is worthy of remark that every one of the passages cited is intimately and immediately associated with the same event, —"The revelation of the Son of Man." And those who commit themselves unreservedly to Him, and to his guidance and keeping, in life and in death, he has promised to raise up at the last day.

Passages which speak of "eternal life" as if at present possessed by believers, have been long well known, but merely quoting them will not suffice. Some good reason should be assigned why these passages are not to be understood as subject to the rule which has been admitted, viz., "That the Divine Word frequently speaks of events of the future in terms of the present," and also of the past. And unless some good reason can be given, passages of this description should no longer be quoted as unquestionable proof that "eternal life" is a gift of the present. Meantime, in the absence of any reason being given, one or

Digitized by Google

two reasons may be stated which seem fully to justify us in understanding them as subject to the above rule, so well expressed by the apostle—"God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were."

1. It will perhaps be admitted that one possessed of "eternal life" cannot die; but our Lord and his apostles, in their teaching, invariably recognise *living* and *dead* believers, and most emphatically state that when the Lord comes there will be dead believers to be made alive and raised, and those "living and believing," who "shall never die," but be "changed." Even in our Lord's words to Martha (John xi. 26), "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die;" dead ones are distinctly owned! The Lord "loved Lazarus," which may be accepted as proof that Lazarus was a believer; but shortly before, the Lord had said, "Lazarus *is dead*." And he also said, "He that believeth in me, though he were *dead*, yet shall he live." Now, if no *un*believer can become a believer after he is dead, and no living believer can die, where can *dead* believers come from? Can any one answer? Yet our Lord's words, "He that liveth and believeth in me shall never die," must be true. I am aware they are rendered "shall not die for ever." For myself, I have no scruple in understanding them to refer to the time and circumstances which formed the leading central thought in the conversation between our Lord and Martha—the "resurrection." Martha mourned a dead brother. "Thy brother shall rise again," said Jesus. "I know," said Martha, "that he shall rise again in the resurrection, at the last day." "I am the resurrection and the life," was the reply of our Lord. Thus the thought is naturally led away from the present, and becomes absorbed in the events of "the last day;" the very first striking features of which are that the "dead" believer shall "live," and the "living believer shall never die;" just as stated by Jesus in verses 25 and 26. And in raising Lazarus he demonstrated the possession of that power to which he laid claim. What a fine practical comment on his words in chap. v. 25-29. "The hour is coming, and *now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and live." "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, when *all* that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth."

2. In making promises to those who had "left all" to follow him, our Lord, in stating what they should receive in "this present time," singles out "everlasting life" as a gift *not to be* bestowed in the "present," in these words, "and in the world to come life everlasting." (Luke xviii. 30.) Why should it be singled out as a gift of the "world to come," if it were a gift of the present?

3. Paul teaches that, to those "who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory," God will give "eternal life," "in the day when he shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to his Gospel." (Rom. ii. 7-16.) To teach that "eternal life" is given before that day, is therefore not according to Paul's gospel.

4. Paul tells us that he himself was "in hope of eternal life," which God that cannot lie had promised:" but he also assures us that "what a man hath, he cannot hope for." The conclusion is therefore forced upon us, that Paul could not be *possessed* of "eternal life," and at the same time in hope of it, for "what a man hath how can he yet hope for?"

Digitized by Google

My statement that "almost every page of Scripture bears witness to the fact," that "God calls things that be not as though they were," is thought "reckless." Closer attention may lead to a different conclusion. Prefatory to his translation, Young says, "The Hebrew writers, when narrating or describing events which might be either *past* or *future* uniformly wrote as if they were alive at the time of the occurrence of the events mentioned, and as *eye-witnesses* of what they are narrating. It would be needless to refer to special passages in elucidation or vindication of this principle, essential to the proper understanding of the sacred text, as every page of this translation affords abundant examples."

This far exceeds my statement. Again he says, "The Hebrews were in the habit of expressing the *certainty of an action taking place* by putting it in the past tense." It may further be added that, on steps being taken, or a movement made towards the obtaining of an object, that object is frequently spoken of as if it were already attained. It would be easy to fill a whole number of the RAINBOW with examples in support of these principles, but my opponent, on this question, should be the last to require them; seeing he has already told us that Paul's saying "I know that what I have committed" (not what I will commit) to him, means his "soul delivered up to Christ when he himself should have ceased in any sort to keep it."

Not only are believers spoken of as if already possessed of "eternal life;" but the impenitent and unfruitful are also spoken of as if that which awaits them had already befallen them. "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit *is* (not shall be) cut down and cast into the fire." "Every branch *in* me that bringeth not forth good fruit *is* cast forth and *is* withered; and men gather them, and they *are* burned." Here we have "*in* me,"—"*is* cast forth,"—"*is* withered,"—"are burned;"—all in the present, and at the same time. "That the dead *are* raised (not shall be raised), Moses has shown." And before the "Redeemer of Israel" was born, thus spake Zechariah by the Spirit; "God hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation unto us in the house of his father David." And, said Jesus, "Now I am no more in the world;" (John xvii.) yet in next chapter we are told "He passed over the brook Cedron." These are only a few examples, but the frequency with which things of the future are spoken of as if present, seems to be the cause why it is so much overlooked. And while, by the application of this distinctly enunciated Divine principle, I am only seeking that harmony and agreement which I am sure pervades the holy oracles, I am accused of making an "inspired writer negative the positive declaration of our Lord;" and of holding what is "in flat contradiction to the words of an apostle!" Were I to say that "the brook Cedron" is in the world, and that our Lord, when "he passed over it" was *still* "in the world;" I would be equally liable to be accused of "flatly contradicting the Lord's previous declaration,—now I am no more in the world."

Such allegations I accept as very satisfactory evidence of how little grounds can be found in my papers for charging me with dealing unfairly with the Word. Neither the Word which God hath given us, nor man whom he hath made, is intended to be dealt with in fragments. In the

Digitized by Google

combination, symmetry, and harmony of the different parts forming the whole, the beauty lies.

I am sorry my remarks referred to on page 280 of June number are thought to be "not very pertinent to the case to which they are applied." I think them very much so; but whether from some misapprehension of my remarks or not, much on the page referred to seems wide from the point; in fact, looks like surrendering the question. I am not "unmindful that hope is embraced within faith;" nor unaware that "Faith is a confidence of things hoped for, as well as the conviction of facts (things) not seen:" but, as already shown, hope is not compatible with the idea of having attained that which is hoped for. "God, that cannot lie," promised "eternal life." Faith lays hold of that promise: the "heirs of promise" have hope as an anchor to the soul, sure and steadfast: and thus we have "eternal life" in promise, in faith, in hope; yea; and in "earnest." But "earnest" is only a pledge—an assurance; it is no part of that of which it is an "earnest."

Heb. xi. 1 is in fine harmony, and affords valuable support to our plea: but by throwing in the words "as well as" between the first and second clause, and substituting the word "facts" for "things" in the latter appears to me only to spoil the passage, by making the "things not seen" of the latter, different from the "things hoped for" in the former clause, instead of making them the same, which I think they are. "Faith is the confidence of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen." As I understand the passage, the "things not seen" of the latter are the same as the "things hoped for" of the former clause, and by this "faith embracing hope" in "things not seen," the ancients —ranked in noble array in this chapter—"obtained a good report;" as witness Noah, who, "By faith in things not seen as yet, prepared an ark to the saving of his house" (ver. 7). And "the things not seen" of the first verse are, I apprehend, the same as the "things not seen and eternal" of 2 Cor. iv. 18, which we "look at," while we "walk by faith, not by sight" (v. 7). But while we "hope for that we *see not*, we with patience wait for," as Rom. viii. 25, even the things "which eye hath not seen," but which God hath "prepared for them that love him." (1 Cor. ii. 9.) Thus the "things not seen," are not only things which *we* have not seen, but things which *no eye hath seen*, but they are things which we have "confidence" in, and "hope for," because they are things "prepared of God for them that love him," and he hath revealed them to the apostles "by the Spirit," and by the apostles he hath revealed them to us. But what things remain to hope for, if all is already possessed which Scripture speaks of as if attained? for even the "inheritance" spoken of by Peter has not been rescued from my category of things spoken of as if attained in a previous paper—"What hope we for?"

And now, so far as this controversy is concerned, I have done for the present, and will not stand in the way of others better able to deal with the question. I hope nothing unbecoming, or calculated to give offence, has been said. Many of the passages advanced against our position, we think, are decidedly in our favour, and none, really and truly, antagonistic, but of this each must judge for himself.

Cupar. J. MILL.

Digitized by Google

# ON THEOLOGY.

IT is scarcely possible to exaggerate the mischief that has been done to the world by the so-called "science" of Theology. Cruelties and horrors unspeakable and without number must be laid to its account. The words *odium theologicum* have become quite proverbial, and mankind at large have not failed to recognise the fact that no more violent or bitter enemies are to be found in the world than religious controversialists.

Marvellous indeed it is, and *a priori* most unlikely, that the study of Divine things should lead to such a result; but the explanation of it, I think, is to be found in the fact, that as a rule theology is an attempt to attain to the knowledge of Divine things through the intellect alone and not through the heart. The Apostle's words are in this relation strictly true: "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity (love) buildeth up." The one is a false and unhealthy distension of the soul, so to speak, the latter a vital assimilation evidenced in the warm and vivid glow of health.

The real fact seems to be that the natural religious emotions are simply emotions, and like all the passions and feelings of the man are just as capable of being perverted and turned to a bad purpose as any other emotions of our nature. Man is *by nature* religious; the religious feeling is as much a part of his nature as any other feeling, and though doubtless given and implanted by the Deity for the purpose of leading us to look beyond the sphere of earth, yet are they, through the perversity of men, turned aside into channels the most impure and horrible. The religious emotions, moreover, being in themselves of a very high order, their corruption is proportionately dangerous and ruinous.

The knowledge of God is not a science to be acquired by learning, as is the case with human science: it is a life to be attained only by steadfastly following him who is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." The very strong and vehement language used by our Lord against the Pharisees and spiritual rulers of the Jews, has sometimes seemed to many to be too severe; but we shall cease to think so when we remember to what horrible cruelties the same spirit which animated the Pharisees ultimately led. No reproaches could be too severe, no indignation too vehement against the nameless horrors and innumerable murders which ensued when the ecclesiastical and theological spirit was in the ascendant. With some of the Pharisees at all events, if not with the majority, hypocrisy also had been largely developed, and in such cases nothing but the direct interposition of God himself can save the soul from becoming relentless and cruel. Unbelief itself is neither so dangerous nor so pitiless as hypocrisy, and that hypocrisy was largely developed in the middle ages, even among the Popes themselves, there is little room to doubt, for we know that many of the Popes and Cardinals in the worst period of the papacy scarcely concealed their disbelief of Christianity while professing to be the worshippers of Christ.

What gave ecclesiasticism such power in the middle ages, however, was the acquiescence of so many good men in the received theology. It would almost seem as if men who give themselves up to the influence of this pseudo-science become at last unable to reason fairly and correctly, and thus the very sincerity and the holy lives of so many, in those as in

Digitized by Google

all ages, became the means of riveting more firmly than ever the iron bolts of sacerdotalism in the human mind, so that it became, humanly speaking, impossible to unfasten them.

It needed, in the case of St. Paul, a direct, special interposition of Christ himself to induce him to reconsider his Jewish theology, and it seems even now that nothing short of such a miracle can open the eyes of some theologians, and induce them to believe in the Universal Fatherhood of Almighty God.

In nothing is the wisdom of Scripture more remarkably shown than in the almost entire absence of anything approaching scientific accuracy in its theology. All its statements of doctrine—if we except some of the apostolic epistles—seem to be thrown together confusedly and without order or exact definition; which fact alone might lead us to question the truth of formally-tabulated systems of theology.

Theology, properly speaking, and using the term in its best sense, is really nothing more than the knowledge of the character of God and of his will. Theology, as usually understood amongst us really means, "our own individual ideas, and fancies, and too often, alas, our own individual *passions* disguised under scriptural words and phrases." As has been too truly said: "We make God the endorser of our own religious opinions," and as a natural consequence the God whom we worship is not the true God; or rather, the true God is unable to manifest himself to us except very partially.

Fortunately for us, however, we are not consistent creatures, and it is well indeed that "The man and the theologian are not one but two." We all of us are acquainted with people, who while holding the most terrible doctrines and, so to speak, breathing out fire and slaughter, are yet personally most gentle and amiable in their lives and conduct. Vast numbers of professing Christians hold some most revolting doctrines in such a manner, that they really have no influence upon them. They profess to believe them, and even try to persuade themselves that they do so; but all the time there is a secret protest against them in the recesses of their hearts.

When, however, the softening influences of many of the principles of Christianity, which were always held to a greater or less extent even in the worst ages,—when these are removed, and the soul is as it were given up to the hard and inflexible dogmas of a so-called theology, then their awful effects are seen in their advocates. It is difficult for us of the present day to understand, much more to enter into the feelings of those who had been educated under the shadow of the great Roman apostasy. Great allowance must be made for the first Reformers if they failed to see things as we see them. They had been so accustomed to hear heresy spoken of as the greatest of sins that it is not to be wondered at if they were unable to shake off the idea. Whilst, therefore, we speak in terms of indignation of many of their acts, we should forbear to judge them harshly, or indeed, to judge them at all. The *first* step, that namely of emerging at all from the iron furnace must have been to them a terrible one, and must have required a marvellous amount of spiritual courage. Everywhere the Church of Rome was so powerful, and men had everywhere and for so many ages acquiesced so unquestioningly in her claims, that it becomes the greatest of marvels how they ever *began*

Digitized by Google

to disclaim her authority. Nothing but her gross and palpable hypocrisy, immorality, and sin could have opened the eyes of mankind as it did. Let us not, therefore, judge any one before the time; but none the less let us judge the principles and the theology that so corrupted the world. If it be a truth, as unquestionably it is, that a tree is known by its fruits, then is it easy to perceive that this theological tree was not planted by God. Probably the best way for us to discover the nature of the fruit produced after the tree had been in existence for a thousand years and the fruit had therefore had time fully to ripen, is to transcribe from the pages of writers of the middle ages some of the expressions used by the elders of the church towards so-called heretics. Take for instance the words of Pope Innocent: "Since we are not to keep faith with those who do not keep faith with God"—in allusion to heretics. When John Huss was sentenced to death, we are told that the prelates pronounced against him these words: "O cursed Judas, who having forsaken the council of peace, art entered into that of the Jews, we take this chalice from thee in which is the blood of Jesus Christ." They then stripped him of his vestments one after another, uttering a curse on stripping him of each. They also put a paper coronet on his head on which they had painted three devils with this inscription; "Arch-heretic," and said, "We devote thy soul to the infernal devils." In Motley's *History of the United Netherlands* we read of the *anto-de-fe* of a young man who was burnt together with his father for heresy. As the flames rose around him the young man called out, "Look, father! I see all heaven opened, and the angels of God coming down to us." At these words a monk who was assisting in piling up fagots replied, "You lie; you see ten thousand devils coming to drag you down to hell."

As we read these words we are forcibly reminded of the words of St. John, in the book of Revelation: "He had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon." For be it observed, all that has been done by the Roman Catholic church has been done under the name of religion and truth.

But waiving such expressions as these, which coming from the lips of professed Romanists are not so much to be wondered at, as being just what might have been expected, and which are, indeed, the logical outcome of such doctrines as were in those days firmly believed in, it is very instructive to notice what professing Protestants thought on these matters, and how they spoke and argued. And if we do so, we shall soon find that there is not so much difference as we might expect. Indeed it is frequently the case that it is difficult to discern any real difference. Let us, then, take some of the expressions used by Calvin, Bucer, Melancthon, and others. I quote from a letter written by Calvin to Sulse, pastor of Basle: "The name of Servetus, who twenty years ago infected the Christian world with his vile and pestilent doctrines, is not I presume unknown to you. He it is of whom Bucer, of blessed memory, that faithful minister of Christ, a man otherwise of the most gentle nature, declared that he deserved to be disembowelled and torn in pieces. We see with what license infidelity stalks abroad, scattering ever new errors, and we have also to note the indifference of those whom God has armed with the sword to vindicate the glory of his name."



Digitized by Google

Then follows the most marvellous statement of all. "If the Papists approve themselves so zealous and so much in earnest for their superstitions that they cruelly persecute and shed the blood of innocent persons, is it not disgraceful in Christian magistrates to show so little heart in defending the assured truth. But where there is the power of prevention, there are surely limits to the moderation that suffers blasphemy to be vented with impunity."* Surely we have here a complete justification of Romish cruelties, and that from the pen of a Protestant: for the Roman Catholic authorities were fully convinced that in punishing Protestants they were doing their best to crush deadly and soul-destroying error.

We find even Melancthon, who at one period of his life seems to have been more tolerant, speaking in similar language. Writing to Calvin, he says, "I have read your able refutation of the horrible blasphemies of the Spaniard, and for the conclusion attained give thanks to the Son of God who was umpire in your contest. The Church too, both of to-day and of the future, owes you thanks and will surely prove itself grateful."* The pastors of the Church of Basle, for instance, are rejoiced to see Servetus in the hands of the magistrates of Geneva; feeling persuaded that they would not be wanting either in saintly zeal or Christian prudence in finding a remedy for an evil that has already led to the ruin of vast numbers of souls."

The theological culpability of the man is also much aggravated in their opinion by the obstinacy and insolence with which he persists in his errors, instead of yielding to the reflections which imprisonment and the instructions of the pastors of Geneva ought to have led him to make. The point especially to be noted being that no charge of immorality or wrong-doing was proved against Servetus. He was put to death solely for holding so-called heretical views, and he died calling on Christ to the very last—"Jesus, thou Son of the Eternal God!"

Yet it is very interesting to observe that, after the execution of Servetus, Calvin is forced to defend himself, and one can see that in so doing his own God-given feelings of pity have to be struggled against in spite of his theological views. His defence is substantially this,—I quote from a very interesting book by Dr. Willis, lately published,—"He who contends that it is unjust to punish heretics and blasphemers, I say, becomes their deliberate associate. . . . Not in vain has God commanded us to suppress every human affection for the sake of religion." Calvin forgets, however, that Christ refused indignantly to call down fire from heaven; that in everything he *submitted* to violence and wrong; that he never for a moment consented to use *force* in anything, and that he died a shameful death when he might have called legions of angels, had he been so disposed, to his assistance. Calvin does not see that the essence of Christianity lies in *suffering with patience*, and in doing that which is kind and good to those who are *not* kind and good to us.

Even had this not been so, however, Calvin had no authority to pronounce what was and what was not heresy. In claiming such authority he was in reality claiming infallibility; for none but God himself can decide as to what is and what is not truth; since none but he can read

* *Servetus and Calvin.* London, 1877.

Digitized by Google

the heart or know what one really means in his heart, even when his words seem wrong.

In showing how strong a hold the peculiar doctrines of theology had at that time on the minds even of the best men and the marvellous degree of horror in which the so-called sin of heresy was held, we may quote the words of Luther himself: "When I was studying at Erfurt, I found in the library of the convent a book entitled, 'The Sermons of John Huss.' I was anxious to know the doctrines of this arch-heretic. My astonishment in the reading of them was incredible. What, thought I, could move the Council to burn so good a man,—so able and judicious an expounder of Scripture? But then the name of Huss was held in abomination; if I mentioned him with honour, I imagined the sky would fall and the sun be darkened. I therefore shut the book with indignation. But I comforted myself with the thought that perhaps he had written this before he fell into heresy." If then such a powerful intellect as Luther's was held in such subjection, we can well understand how slow was the progress made by the first Reformers. When we see, as above stated, a man like Bucer declaring that Servetus deserved to be disembowelled and torn in pieces, solely on account of his heretical views, we may form some idea of the awful power that Satan was permitted to have over the minds of men. During the Middle Ages we not unfrequently read of holocausts of Jews being offered up to appease the Deity, as was supposed. I question indeed whether any form of religion has been guilty of greater cruelties than orthodox Christianity; and of these cruelties unquestionably theology has been, if not the cause, certainly the accomplice; for it has constantly presented to the world as objects of faith—any doubt or disbelief of which involved eternal perdition—dogmas so terrible and propositions so absurd, that those who received them became at last as it were stupefied and drugged; "drunken, but not with wine."

As bearing on this subject I am tempted to transcribe a passage from a writer of the present day. I quote from a work published some years ago, entitled, "The Complete Triumph of Moral Good over Evil." At page 285 the writer says: "Systematic theology has so perverted and confused the heart-stirring declarations of the Sacred Volume, that the recognised teachers of religion, who are trained and instructed in the schools of divinity, are rather disqualified for preaching the Gospel in its power and simplicity, instead of being enlightened and animated to the noble work. They go through a course of bewildering dissertations and expositions in many of which is found a marvellous expenditure of verbose ingenuity to invest puerilities with an aspect of grandeur and to depress the most exalted verities to the level of puerilities. Their ordeal may be compared in some respects to that of the young rabbi who applied himself to the study of the Talmud, with a reverential and joyful belief that he had been admitted into the temple of truth, and gradually became deprived of the vigour and elasticity of his intellectual faculties. . . . The system itself must be attacked by those who venerate and love the Scriptures, and believe that they exhibit a God of wisdom, rectitude and goodness; and not a being more pitiless than Moloch, more ruthlessly destroying than the sanguinary deities of India." And again, at p. 253, "If a man becomes convinced that the Bible, instead of revealing

Digitized by Google

a restricted plan of benevolence or a system of partiality and favouritism, really discloses the unwearied and the most self-denying efforts of the Creator to work out the permanent welfare and happiness of all his intelligent creatures; 'a horror of great darkness' is removed from the mind and the aspect of the universe is altogether changed."

Not until men learn to throw off the authority of human theology, and to trust themselves as it were to God and his Word alone, will brighter and more hopeful views take possession of their hearts. They will then, and only then, begin to see that God is not such as man is, but infinitely higher and better in every way. The effect of theology on the heart seems, as a matter of historical fact, to have been simply *petrifying*. All the brightest and most hopeful views of both the future of the human race and of the mercy of the Deity have arisen, not from improvements in theology, but from without. It is to be feared that almost all our humane sentiments have been forced on us by the influence of the secular press and not from the so-called religious world. It would, indeed, almost seem as if theology required every now and then to be purged by a great wave of secularism, not to say infidelity, before it will yield up its hard, cruel dogmas, and even then it does so grudgingly. So much is this the case that in Mr. Maude's words, "It is really questionable whether we should have much reason to deplore the sweep of a great and swiftly-moving wave of Atheism over the world, if only it buried for ever beneath its dark and deadly waters the many gross and hideous forms in which the blindness and ignorance of men have embodied their conceptions of the Deity."* The only real preservative from the ill-effects of theology is the spirit of *love*, the spirit that is, which actuates our Father in heaven. And this love, to be effectual, must be a real love to God and to man. Our Lord sums up the whole spiritual essence of the Law, and by consequence also in a much higher degree, of Christianity, in these two commandments: Love to God, and love to one's neighbour; and in both cases the love is to be an all-absorbing, all-powerful feeling. That love, had it been earnest and real enough, would have taught the early Reformers that punishment or vengeance in spiritual things was not for them. "Vengeance is mine," saith the Lord, "*I* will repay." In every case where conscience is concerned this is and must be our guide; to leave God himself to execute judgment. He will surely do so in an infinitely better and more effectual manner than we can do in our ignorance and madness. The Apostle's words apply with redoubled force in the case of conscience: "Judge nothing before the time."

* T. W.

---

* "Our Hope," vol. i. p. 1.

Digitized by Google

# WHAT ARE YOU LOOKING FOR?

"For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, *we should live* soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; *looking for that blessed hope, and* (even) *the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*"—TITUS ii. 13.

"WE should live—*looking!*" And so we do,—but *for what?* It would be well, perhaps, if the vast multitude of professing Christians around us, could be taken apart individually, and have each one the question seriously put to him, "*What are you looking for?*" It is to be feared, nay, rather it is quite certain, that with the very large majority it would be found that they were really looking for nothing *beyond the present scene:* that the business, the cares, the interests, and the pleasures of this life altogether monopolised their attention: that they were day by day so earnestly looking at the things that are seen and temporal that they neither desired nor designed to look off to those higher and better things which are unseen and eternal.

"*What am I looking for?*" might one reply: "Well, I am looking for such an increase in my business as will enable me speedily to accumulate sufficient wealth to live in ease and respectability for the remainder of my days, and when I die leave my children a step higher up the social ladder than where I began."

"*What am I looking for?*" would another say: "I am looking for some means whereby my worldly circumstances shall be so improved that I may prudently marry the woman I have selected as my future wife, and so share domestic joys which are the best and purest this earth can afford."

"*What am I looking for?*" might the man of science answer: "I am looking for some great discovery which shall give me world-wide fame, and enrol my name for ever among those of the illustrious sons of science."

"*What am I looking for?*" might the politician reply: "I am looking for the triumph of my party;" or, if of nobler aims, "for the passing of some great measure of social reform, the repeal of some flagrant, the righting of some ancient, wrong."

But yonder methinks I see one whose bent form, hollow cheeks, and sunken eyes, tell too plainly that, for him at least, nothing can avail that earth can give, either of triumph or of joy, for more than a few brief days. To him, then, I repeat my question, "Friend, what are *you* looking for?" He lifts his heavy eye, and a sad, dubious smile flits over his emaciated features as he replies, "*I am looking for death.*"

Alas, yes! from many indeed would such answers as these be received. But how many, think you,—how many I mean not of the men of the world, the merely careless and profane, but earnest souls, professing Christians, those whom we have every reason to hope and believe love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity? How many, even of such as these, I repeat, can make the language of the apostle their own and say, "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared unto *me*, teaching me that—denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, *I should live*—

Digitized by Google

*looking for that blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ!*"

And yet Paul's language is sufficiently explicit. He distinctly tells us that the grace of God was manifested in order that not Titus and himself alone, but God's people generally at that time, might so live. *And should it not be so still?* Yes; and bear with me, reader, if I say further that no Christian who does not so live, is living as God would have him live; that no Christian who does not so live is living in the position of the faithful servant whose loins are girt about and whose lamp is burning; that every Christian who does not so live has, *in this respect*, received the grace of God in vain.

The coming of the Lord was, we know, indeed the blessed hope of the Church of Christ in its first and best days. It runs like a thread of gold through all the apostolic writings of the New Testament. It is used as the incentive to the exercise of every Christian grace; as the sufficient consolation under every form of trial; and as the infallible criterion of meetness for Christ's coming kingdom.

What does Paul say of his Thessalonian converts: "Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God, and to *wait for his Son from heaven*" (1 Thess. i. 10). How does he endeavour to comfort those among them who had been bereaved? "I would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning those which are asleep, that ye sorrow not even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent—or go before—them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we, which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we be ever with the Lord. Wherefore *comfort one another with these words*" (1 Thess. iv. 13-18).

It is ever so. Does Paul exhort believers to manifest their moderation to absence of undue carefulness regarding temporal things, it is in such words as these: "Let your moderation be known unto all men. *The Lord is at hand.* Be careful for nothing" (Phil. iv. 5, 6). Or is patience or perseverance the grace which another apostle would have them exhibit, then he says: "Be patient, brethren, *unto the coming of the Lord.* Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruits of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain. Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts; *for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh*" (James v. 7, 8).

How many and how precious are the promises made to those, and *to those only*, who love and look for the Lord appearing. "Henceforth," said Paul, when ready to be offered up and when the time of his departure was at hand, "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them *that love his appearing* (2 Tim. iv. 8). "Christ was offered," he says in another place, "to bear the sins of many; and *unto them that look for him* shall he appear the

Digitized by Google

second time without sin unto salvation" (Heb. ix. 28). "Let your loins be girt about," said the Lord himself, "and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he shall return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open to him immediately. Blessed is that servant whom the Lord, when he cometh, shall find watching" (Luke xii. 35-37).

The very last promise which the Bible contains is couched in these words, "Surely I come quickly;" and the last sweet echo of Revelation which lingers on the ear, is the Church's *Amen* to that promise: "Amen, even so, come, Lord Jesus."

But the inquiry, What are we looking for? besides its *personal* application has another more general but scarcely less important, *What is to be the future of the Church and the World?* In this respect what are we looking for? This is a question which can hardly fail to suggest itself to every thoughtful mind at the present day. Mighty and accumulating forces of good and evil are at work around us. The battle becomes hotter, and the issue, to human foresight at least, more doubtful, day by day. Truly the word of God is tried to the uttermost. Christianity we are not untruly told is on its trial. Well, and what is to be the result? Shall it conquer and plant its victorious flag on the high towers of a world won to Christ? or shall the banner of the Cross go down beneath the dark inrolling tide of a science that seeks in vain after God, and an infidelity that blasphemes his name? Which are we to look for? For remember, I beseech you, should you be disposed to feel indignation at the suggested possibility of an adverse result, that Christ and *Christianity* must never be confounded. The Christian dispensation may end, and if I read the prophetic page aright will end, in apostasy, defeat, and judgment; but nevertheless Christ's kingdom is an everlasting kingdom which shall not pass away, and his dominion that which shall not be destroyed. Bearing this in mind, then, I ask again the question, What is to be the future of the Church and of the World? How is to be inaugurated that gold age on which the prophetic eye of humanity has ever been fixed with a yearning, an imperishable hope? The question is indeed a momentous one, and, speaking generally, I may say that four answers have commonly been returned to it.

1. The first is that of Popery, or, as it prefers to be called, Catholicism; and it is to this effect: Our Lord Jesus Christ delivered to St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and declared him to be the rock on which he would build his church,—that church against which the gates of hell should not prevail. Now the Pope is the successor of St. Peter, the promise made to the latter is therefore inherited by the former, and the ultimate triumph of the Church secured. Sooner or latter the union of Christendom will be accomplished; the breach which has for centuries divided the Eastern and Western churches will be healed; all Protestant opposition will be overcome; infidelity shall no longer exist: "The mountain of the Lord's house"—that is the Papacy—"shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it." The Church of Rome shall attain to universal dominion, and in the person of his infallible vicar Christ shall take unto him his great power and reign.

Digitized by Google

It is a splendid dream, and doubtless, to those who believe in it, affords an animating prospect. But seeing that it is based upon falsehood, not upon truth, that it would be in reality only the triumph of that sorest of all the curses which God has permitted to afflict humanity—*Priestcraft*; and that it is but an impious attempt to antedate Christ's millennial kingdom, and to give to a sinful man the honour that belongs only to the Divine Saviour, we may safely put *this* answer to our question aside as being only *the Pope's millennium.**

2. What is to be the future of the Church and the world? Again we ask the question, and now from a very different quarter a very different answer comes to us. It is the answer of that rapidly increasing party silently mustering under the banner of scientific materialism and philosophic scepticism. These men tell us that Christianity is an effete and worn out superstition; that the Bible has no better claim to be regarded as a trustworthy revelation from God than the Koran or the Vedas; that in point of fact we do and can know nothing of any higher powers, if such there be, than the matter and force out of which the universe is evolved: that death in all probability ends our existence, or, at all events, if there be such a thing as a future life, we neither know, nor ever can know anything about it here. Consequently, by and bye, men will cease to trouble themselves about these idle inquiries and apply themselves rather to the real and practical business of life,—that business being to be happy now instead of speculating whether we shall or shall not be happy hereafter. Then, to this end, seeing that kings and priests, the Bible and the religions, have ever been the great troublers of mankind, all these must be swept away, and social democracy, scientific progress, and universal education, become the watchwords of a new and better era. Now it may be quite possible that God in righteous judgment will permit men in the pride and folly of their hearts to try this awful experiment. It seems from the teaching of prophecy only too probable. We know from the testimony of Scripture what is to be the true character of the closing days of the present dispensation, now so nigh at hand. Paul tells us of the coming of that wicked or lawless one "who is to oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

But this cannot be the end. Evil cannot finally triumph in a universe Divinely ruled. Dark as the gethering night may be, the eternal morning lies beyond. Our world and our race belong not to the devil but to God. "Yet," says the Lord in that glorious second Psalm,—"yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession.'" Therefore, whatever indications there may be either in the Word or in the world of its temporary ascendency, we must repudiate the materialistic programme thus presented to us, as being in nothing better than *the Devil's millennium*.

8. The third answer to our question is one which demands our more

* For the classification of millenniums here adopted I am in part indebted to a well-known essay by the late Rev. D. Maitland.

Digitized by Google

serious and respectful attention; it is what I may call the Protestant and Evangelical answer: the answer probably which some of our readers would give to the inquiry, What is to be the future of the Church and the world? It is briefly this: The world is to be converted to Christ by the preaching of the Gospel and the power of the Spirit accompanying that preaching. By some future great revival movements, resembling in character, but far exceeding in effect those we have recently witnessed; by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on a scale that shall altogether eclipse that of the day of Pentecost; by more abundant and manifest blessing on all missionary labours: in short, by our more diligent use of all existing spiritual agencies, the kingdoms of this world are gradually to merge into the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and all the glowing pictures of the prophetic page be substantially, if not literally realised.

Let me not here be misunderstood. I am not for one moment calling in question either the power of Christ's Gospel or the grace of his Spirit thus to convert the world. But this is not the question. The inquiry is this, What warrant have we for concluding that it shall be so? Is this really the work which the Gospel was designed to accomplish? On the contrary, is not this plainly a dispensation of election, not of universality? Must not the wheat and the tares grow together even unto the harvest, which is the end of the age? Is it not nearly 1900 years since the Gospel was first preached, and are there any signs of the world's conversion yet? For nearly a century missions to the heathen have been carried on, What is the net result to-day? As I said just now, we know from prophecy that this dispensation is to end in apostasy, not in triumph, and therefore, seeing that it is founded on no certain warrant of God's word, but rather on ignorance of his revealed purposes concerning the future, we are compelled to regard even this hope, widely as it has been and still is cherished by true Christians, as being, after all, only *Man's millennium.*

4. But blessed be God, though we cannot hope for the world's conversion by the preaching of the Gospel, still our faith in God forbids the thought that evil shall ultimately prevail, and we need not be without a surer hope either for the Church or the world, if we live looking for "the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." Yes, for the world and every nation in it; for the Church as well as for the individual believer, all my hopes are bound up in this. Do you tell me that the night is growing dark? It may be so, but *the Lord is coming.* Do you tell me that the enemies of Zion are banded together for her destruction? It may be so, but *the Lord is coming.* Do you tell me that faith is waxing low, and love cold, and indifference death-like? It may be so, but *the Lord is coming.*

As we trace the history of the past we see plainly that each dispensation has ended in failure on man's part, and immediate signal interposition on God's, and so it shall again. No evangelisation of the world till the Lord comes; no binding of Satan till the Lord comes; no resurrection of the dead in Christ till the Lord comes; no rapture of the living in Christ till the Lord comes; no establishment of the promised kingdom of truth and righteousness, of peace and glory, till the Lord comes. "The glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ," and that alone, will introduce *God's millennium.*

READER,—DO YOU LIVE LOOKING FOR THIS? • D. M. A.

Digitized by Google

# CORRESPONDENCE.

## THE DOCTRINE AND ITS NAME.

DEAR SIR,—I am obliged to General Goodwyn for giving the opportunity of saying that the words "tormented for the ages of ages, that they have yet to live," were struck out of the second edition of my "Glory of Christ." The first edition was published under extreme pressure, and was disfigured by several blots, that being decidedly the worst. Having given my view of the Apocalyptic "torment" in both "The Way Everlasting," and "The Harmony of Scripture," it is needless to repeat it here. I cannot, however, agree with the General, that destruction will necessarily be "one act," and that, if I rightly understand him, unaccompanied by suffering; nor was I aware that any of our friends had ever maintained such a view. Surely "weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth," no less than "indignation, and wrath, tribulation, and anguish," imply a "process" long or short.

Having the pen in my hand, may I recur to our banner? I am perfectly willing to give up "Conditional Immortality," if a better can be found: but it may be well to point out the requirements of a good title: 1. It must be easily pronounced—I cannot think of an exception to this—Calvinism, Arminianism, Millenarianism, High Church, Low Church, Broad Church, the Trinity, the Atonement, Justification by Faith, Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, Auricular Confession, and so on. How would "Immortality in Christ alone" run with these? People *would not* be at the trouble of getting their tongue round it. 2. It should indicate our view distinctly. "Life in Christ," though excellent as the title of a book, would not do for this purpose; as the enemy would say, "Oh, of course, we all believe that." 3. It should express the positive side of our view. On this ground "Destructionism" would be objectionable, even if our opponents were not certain to change it into "Annihilationism," on the ground that *they*, too, believe in destruction,—i.e., either of the happiness, or of the sinfulness, of the condemned. 4. It must be accepted, for the sake of convenience, by friend and foe.

To my mind, "Conditional Immortality" meets these requirements pretty fairly. It is certainly being widely accepted, though with some wry faces, by the other side. And as Immortality is offered, directly or indirectly, "to him that overcometh," in every one of the messages to the Seven Churches, it is hard to see why *we* should object to the term.

Yours, very truly,
SAMUEL MINTON.

## CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.

DEAR SIR,—I see there is some discussion in your "correspondence" columns as to the propriety of the expression, "Conditional Immortality." I think the grounds of objection to it are more apparent than real. So long as it is understood that the immortality is conditional, not on any merit in man, but simply on our being by grace united to Christ our life, there can surely be no real ground

Digitized by Google

of objection to it. While the apparent ground of objection, like the apparent, surface, difficulties in Scripture, may be useful as suggesting inquiry and promoting thought about what we hold.

I venture to say, however, that it is incorrect to speak, as many do, of faith as the gift of God. That is nowhere said in Scripture. Certainly not in Eph. ii. 8, which is so often quoted as saying it. What is there said to be the gift of God and not of ourselves, is our being saved by grace through faith. That is evident not so much from the word "that"—τοῦτο—being neuter while "faith"—πίστις—is feminine, as from the words that follow in the next verse—"Not of works, lest any man should boast." What does the Apostle say is "not of works?" Not faith, surely,—there would be no sense in that—but our salvation, of which he says five things: that it is "by grace," that it is "through faith," that it is "not of ourselves," that it is "the gift of God," that it is "not of works." Faith in Christ is indeed the gift of God. It is "given" us "in the behalf of Christ, . . . to believe on him" (Phil. i. 29). But faith itself is no more the gift of God than love, fear, hope, or any other faculties which all men have by nature. It requires faith to believe a lie or to believe any ordinary news, good or bad.

This is no mere matter of words. Many, I believe, as some I have known, are excusing themselves for not believing God's Word about Christ by saying, "Faith is the gift of God, and he has not given it to us." We ought to be ready to answer "God *has* given you faith, as well as love and hope and fear, and God bids you with these faculties which you have, and use every day, to believe in him, to love him, to hope in him, and to fear him." If it is retorted that we admit, as above, that to use these faculties Godwards and Christwards (which men freely enough use manwards and even devilwards) is the gift of God; then the great truth is brought out of the natural depravity of fallen men, and the need of God's special grace to counteract it, and men are shown that it is the Godward inclination that is wanting in them, not any God-given faculty, and that man, not God, is to blame for unbelief; which is man's fault, not merely his misfortune.

But to return to "Conditional Immortality." I believe that the expression is now fairly current, and that it is too late to recall it. Our adversaries have taken it up, and, moreover, call us, in consequence, "Conditionalists." Well, we have no great objection to the name; but suggests to me the name by which I think we ought to call them, instead of calling them, to our own prejudice, "orthodox," or "Catholic," or any such good name which, I hope, belongs to us rather than to them. They call us "*Con*ditionalists. We may well call them "*Tra*ditionalists;" for their views about immortality are really based on the traditions of men, and not on the Word of God. I hope this nomenclature of "*con*" and "*tra*ditionalist" will pass without *contra*-diction.

2. General Goodwyn, in his paper in last month's RAINBOW, on "Many and Few Stripes," builds much of his argument on the words of 2 Tim. iv. 1, when it is said that "the Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing and his kingdom.*"

But it is now generally admitted that that is a wrong reading of the passage, and that the word "κατὰ,"

Digitized by Google

rendered "at," should be, according to the three oldest manuscripts, "και," "and;" and that the verse should read, "I charge thee, therefore, before God and Christ Jesus who is about to judge the quick and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom." So Bishop Ellicott and the late Dean Alford—others adopting also the corrected reading—translate the verse, "I testify before God and Christ Jesus, who is about to judge the quick and the dead, both of his appearing and his kingdom." But the former seems more likely to be the apostles' meaning. I may mention that "κάι" is rejected and "κατὰ" retained instead, by Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, as well as by Alford and Ellicott.

This is a matter of interest and importance to pre-millenialists, for as the verse stands at present in our English Bible it certainly *seems* to teach against them that the general judgment of quick and dead will be *at* Christ's appearing.

Yours faithfully,
W. T. Hobson.

St. Barnabas Parsonage,
Douglas.

---

## "CHRISTIANITY IN SOLUTION."

Dear Sir,—Mr. Maude is certainly gifted with a skilful mysteriousness of composition that renders explanation a necessity for simple minds; a necessity that must be my plea for this letter, because, in the following instance, the issue is of solemn import, whilst a shade of inconsistency *appears* to rest on the opinions expressed.

Mr. Maude, in his paper on "Christianity in Solution," asserts that "God is the Father of *all* men, not merely of a comparatively small number of arbitrarily elected favourites," nor as his offspring by creation only, but in the highest and holiest sense of the relationship (pp. 28-30 of Rainbow for January). Moreover, in the same paper (p. 31), he admits that "terror, suffering, or death," may be the award of obdurate sinners who are not of the "elected favourites." Now, *if* these sinners really have the privilege of calling God "Father" *in the above sense* during their life in the world, does it not inevitably follow that God will destroy his own children at last, having lured them all their lives into a feeling of security under the shelter of an affiliation that was but imaginary after all?

Mr. Maude has quoted that portion of the Lord's parable in Luke xv. that refers to the prodigal, not observing that the relationship of Father and Son existed prior to the relapse of the latter, and that the parable is a metaphorical history of *restorative* love, and not that of reconciliation to an alien. I thought I had explained this in the February number of the Rainbow of 1877, p. 77!

He has also quoted a statement of Mr. Edward White's, in his able refutation of Mr. Baldwin Brown's "miserable doctrine" of Universalism ("Life and Death," pp. 27, 28), though Mr. Maude has extracted but a fragment of the argument without the context that so firmly supported it. Mr. White will be better able to rebut Mr. Maude's use of his language than I can; but I would remind Mr. Maude of the apostolic truth that "Sons of God," in the higher sense of the relationship, are such *only* "by faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. iii. 26.) That "*As many* as received the Word made flesh, *to them* gave he power to become the Sons of God, to them that be-

Digitized by Google

lieve on his name" (John i. 12-14). That, "*As many* as are led by the "Spirit of God, *they* are Sons of God." (Romans viii. 14.) That "the children of God" are plainly distinguished from "the children of the devil;" in that the former are "born of God," and the principles of the Divine life is in them tending to practical righteousness rather than to sin. (1 John iii. 9, 10.) The whole "world *might be* saved," for "Jesus tasted death for every man;" all *might be* saved, *might* enjoy the Divine relationship of Sons could they have attained to the inseparable condition of divine righteousness by reception of the Gospel of the peace of God. Yet, what do we read? "The righteousness of God, *which is by faith of Jesus Christ* is (presented) unto all," but nevertheless it is only "*upon all them that believe*," be they who they may. The recorded condition of the world—as such—is, that it "*loves* darkness rather than light," (John iii. 19), and, therefore, is said to be "lying in the wicked one." (1 John v. 19. Alford's translation.)

I am faithfully yours,
H. Goodwyn.

Wellington House, Clevedon,
Somerset.

---

## CONFERENCE TESTIMONY.

Dear Sir,—Permit me to express the hope that the proposal of General Goodwyn may be taken into serious consideration. The *results* of our first conference who can estimate? Up to that time the discussion on the momentous question of the future life was confined to comparatively narrow limits. At the present time, as you truly say, "the world rings with the doctrine." Unquestionably, the "Reports" of that conference in the "upper room" of the Cannon Street Hotel, gave to the discussion a place such as it had never held before. Do, Sir, lend your pen and influence in furtherance of this object, and God will be glorified by it.

Yours sincerely,
Blandford. J. J. Hobbs.

---

# Literature.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

*Biblical Things not Generally Known.* Part 2.

*Triplicate Paper on Triunities.* By A. F. Morgan.

*Errors and Terrors of Blind Guides.* The popular doctrine of everlasting pain refuted. By N. G. Wilkins, M.A.

*Life in Christ.* By Edward White. Third edition, revised and enlarged.

The Vol. for 1877 of each of the following:—

*The Methodist Visitor. The Methodist Temperance Magazine. The Methodist Family. The Missing Link Magazine. The Sower, and The Little Gleaner.*

*The Bible Companion;* showing how to read the whole of the Bible in a year. By G. Washington Moon, F.R.S.L.

*The End of the World Near; or Antichrist, the Beast of Rev.* xiii. By James M. Swormstedt, Cincinnati.

*Expository Lectures* on the First Epistle of St. Peter. By the Rev. Thornley Smith. London: R. D. Dickinson.

These lectures are obviously the result of much careful thought, and they deserve a hearty welcome from Christian thinkers. Of course we are not supposed to endorse every statement in a book of more than three hundred pages, dealing with some much controverted topics, but

Digitized by Google

we cheerfully commend the volume as containing much that will be helpful to growth in grace. Mr. Thornley Smith is a clever writer and a good scholar, and has added to the theological library, in these four expositions, a volume that will live.

## NOTICES.

*The Restitution* (Plymouth, Indiana), says:—"The RAINBOW has put in its most welcome appearance. We have missed its very desirable visits for four months past. As a periodical it is unsurpassed for ability, in its articles on Millenarian topics. It is also an invincible champion of Bible teachings in relation to the great questions of human destiny. We hope its worthy editor, Dr. Leask, will kindly remember us in the future; as we miss nothing more, in our exchanges, than the RAINBOW whenever it fails to reach us.

*The Eastern Post* says:—"The RAINBOW contains able papers, bearing on the 'Revealed Future of the Church and the World,' by General Goodwyn, Aspirator, Henry Deacon, M. W. Strang, W. Maude, Henry Constable, and others, which are well worth reading by all who desire to know what can be said about the future state."

*The Hackney and Kingsland Gazette* says:—"The first number of the new volume shows that the vitality of this excellently edited and written magazine, which is devoted to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World, and the condemnation of the theory of everlasting suffering, is well maintained. It advocates Scripture inquiry and intelligent faith in the Word of God, and freedom from the doctrinal discord, ecclesiastical confusion, sectarian rivalries, theatrical ritualism, hierarchical pomp and vanity, and infidel dogmas, surrounding us.

*The Mining Journal* says:—"The RAINBOW opens with an address upon the New Year by the editor, which is the most admirable address on the opening year we have met with. Dr. Leask's style is remarkable for its grace, ease, and rhetorical beauty, and his thought is characterised by remarkable force and vigour. The next article is from a well-practised pen, the learned and eloquent General H. Goodwyn. He takes especial pleasure in dealing severe logic against superstitious theories of religion, and scientific conceits. In the present article he shines as an exegetical scholar. 'The *Argumentum ad Hominem*' is the title of an article by another able hand. Mr. Maude contributes a very elaborate article on 'Christianity in Solution.' The subject is, as far as we know, original, and it is handled in a manner that befits it. Mr. Henry Constable devotes an article to strictures upon the lecture of Professor Torrance on 'Future Punishment,' a solemn subject, discussed with becoming gravity. There is reading for all sorts of men in this RAINBOW, who love serious thought and profound reasoning."

BACK VOLUMES OF THE RAINBOW.—The Publisher has a few volumes of the RAINBOW for 1875 and 1876, which he is willing to dispose of at 4s. 6d. each. Early application is necessary, as only a few copies are to be had at this rate, and the orders will be executed as they arrive. Application, accompanied by a P. O. Order, must be made direct to Elliott Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

MARCH, 1878.

## THE HOPE OF THE CHURCH.

WHILE one of the Cæsars was reigning with iron force over the world, a distinguished Syrian nobleman was called to Rome to receive a vassal kingdom. Before he departed to the seat of imperial honour and glory, he gathered his friends and dependents, and put his immense estate into their hands, allotting to each his work, and promising great reward for faithful service and continual remembrance. In the midst of much weeping, and many vows and benedictions, the nobleman started on his long journey. For a short time there was great labour on the estate, and many earnest prayers for the return of the master. In fact it became marked that those who were most distinguished by conscientiousness, honesty, and manliness had their deep life nourished by the prospect of his return. The brightness of his eye was upon them, the gladness of his countenance kindled them into power and animation.

It came to pass that while he tarried many long days some began to say that he never would return—and some bolder ones, that he had never been here. Some said that he had forsaken the estate, and it belonged to them in absolute possession—and others, that he only dreamed of a kingdom, and could give no rewards. Hence, they concluded to seek power, splendour, and privilege in the present, leaving the future, of which they knew nothing, to sooth-sayers and Chaldeans. In the long-run they began to revile and beat each other, and had alternate seasons of revelry and violence, passions of evil were let loose, and blood ran freely as rain in winter. The parable is not obscure.

In the fulness of the time there appeared one who had all the moral and supernatural grandeur of a King, and he claimed the right and the power to establish the kingdom of prophecy. The unsullied sanctity of his character, the wondrous majesty of his works, the



Digitized by Google

profound wisdom of his teaching, the open recognition of the Father from heaven, all combined in declaring him to be the Son of God, and the Prince of life. His ambassadors—forbidden to enter into any Samaritan or Gentile city—went through all the coasts of Israel with one cry, That the kingdom of God was at hand. Nigh it must have been, when the King himself was present, and the powers of the world to come were revealed in such affluence. The kingdom had descended upon them, and the King was seeking, by all the charming attractions of heaven, to gather the people under the sheltering wings of his love and his life. No one will deny a manifest change in his final aspect towards them when it became manifest that he was rejected by the nation. He taught them that they would die in their sins, that their house would be left to them desolate, and that they would never see him again until they could say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Nor did he leave the early teaching without distinct and explicit correction. For, when in the midst of the triumphal procession, some began to think that the kingdom of God would immediately appear; he taught them that the nobleman must go into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. Whatever differences there may be among us as to the nature of that moral dominion which he did establish, it is beyond controversy that the kingdom which he went to receive in the far country cannot come into manifestation until his return.

The apostles and their fellow-labourers all lived and taught as if the day of the Lord and the kingdom of glory were at hand, and their most forcible and impassioned appeals have their spring and roots in such ground. It will not be denied by any one grounded in Church history that the great leading men of the early Church made the coming of our Lord and the kingdom of prophecy, as the Gospel hope, exceedingly prominent, though the interval was wide, and the descent very great from the sobriety and dignity of Paul, Peter, and John, to that presentation of the truth which may be found in Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and Lactantius. Such allegorists as Dionysius did mischief in confounding some simple people; but the chief ruin came when Constantine avowed himself a Christian, and took the Church under his imperial wings of darkness. The divinest realities which had lived through storm and bloodshed perished in court favour, only lingering in a few solitary hearts which were not debauched by political influences. When the bishops became companions and councillors of royalty, and persecuting rage was not only arrested, but succeeded by great benefaction in the power, honour, and glory, of this world, they seemed to think that the sublime kingdom of prophecy had become a reality, and they lived and intrigued and caballed in accordance with the growing darkness and degradation. How rapid and how appalling the corruption which followed! The constellations disappeared. One star after another went out. Sacerdotalism became

Digitized by Google

intense and arrogant. Idolatry followed hard with worship of rags, relics, images, and, overshadowing all, the worship of a woman. It was the morning star which was blotted out when saintly mediators and Mary substantially displaced the *One* Mediator. Then came transubstantiation, purgatory, indulgences, priestly celibacy, and all the malformed falsehoods which gradually darkened into the glooms of the middle ages. The Lutheran trumpet blast was to a large extent political, though not without gracious spiritual consequences. But the Reformation of the sixteenth century was a very partial work, and the fogs and miasma of the Pontine marshes are still heavy upon us. The Lutheran theology mainly dealt with a present salvation, the justification of the sinner before God. One half of the Lord's work, his redemption of nature, was almost entirely ignored. The great adoption, the manifestation of the Sons of God in their immortal beauty and sovereign power never received any earnest treatment, and that exceeding glory towards which the whole creation moves, and for which every creature sighs, was scarcely in the field of contemplation. The old papal concept still seemed to rule and reign, of getting into glory one by one and enjoying in ghost condition the vision of God and the blessedness.

The volcanic storm of the French Revolution was not long in following the Lutheran revolt, and the hard black frost of German rationalism was close upon the French eruption.

Such periods of death and convulsion did not seem likely periods for the revival of any ancient hope. Yet it was really in the midst of such dread moral scenery that many devout souls began to say, as they did in Israel, "Why speak ye no word about bringing back the King?" After long bad ages of blasphemy, sin, and rebuke, after a terrible night of evil dreams and evil deeds, tremendous periods of superstition and moral darkness, a cry began to arise—"Behold the bridegroom cometh. The nobleman has received the kingdom and is coming for its manifestation." When this cry went forth old passages in the document of life, which had seemed without meaning, began to glow with wonderful significance. They speak of waiting, watching, fasting, praying, looking, and desiring; and those who began to read and understand began to rise on tip-toe with loins girded and lamps burning.

A man of some mark as a scientist takes in hand occasionally to mock us and our hope; but alas! he has nothing to offer. He says we are all melting away into the infinite azure; hence, the professor is nothing better than the gas he plays with in the laboratory.

We do not admire the melting process, nor the result. We would rather see all the orient crimsoned and glorified by the splendour of his appearing, who hath life in himself, and likewise the power of giving it freely as eternal possession.

On the coming of our Lord we have a few words which we trust may be profitable to all believers in the Son of God.



Digitized by Google

When the disciples were to be left as a trunk bleeding at every pore, the departing Head gave such consolation as was fitting. "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you to myself, that where I am there ye may be also." * A poor simple child who has got somewhat muddled among divines and sceptics says, "How sweet that reads; but is he really coming personally?" Personally! The Lord be gracious to us! In what other way could he come? It is quite possible that the apostles, notwithstanding all their explicit teaching, were straining their eyes as if they would never see him again, and sobbing as if their hearts would break. "Men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? the same Jesus now taken from you, will so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." † This has the ring of the true metal.

Young man—looking for the return of an absent mother, who is your very ideal of grace and loveliness—do you want her back in figure and shadow? Is it a ghost or a true, sweet woman you are looking for? Wife, whose husband—long away in a foreign country—is the embodiment of all your belief and trust in the noble and heroic, in truth and tenderness, in purity and valour, is it the man you are looking for, or a phantom!

Not a shadow do you desire; you have seen too many in the long separation; but you long for the true personal man in the grace and glory of his manhood.

Holy Scripture gives no countenance to gnostic dreaming. The verities of Christianity are not so much phantasmagoria, or shadows on the walls of time. They are, from Incarnation to Second Advent, all great and supreme realities. Our Lord is indeed a true Person, and must be revealed as such, Son of Man and Son of God. Son of Man! the true, the perfect, the immaculate Man, the firstborn of the new creation, and as such God's ideal of what humanity should be. Son of God, firstborn of all creation, born in eternity as well as in time, and declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead; still further to be declared when he appears with the ancient name written upon him, and we see with finer vision all the clustering glories which belong to his nature and rank, to his office and his work.

It is surely Jesus the anointed that we want. We know something of the promises. A country glorified by renovation, every curse repealed, until the desert blossoms like the rose, and the healing rivers run with life; a city so sacred that it needs no temple, and so bright that it needs no luminary; where the streets are shining gold, and the blessed river runs from the throne of power, on the banks of which the tree of life blooms with fruit un-

* John xiv. 1-3. † Acts i. 10, 11.

Digitized by Google

fading; and immortal companies of saints and angels in glory beyond all speech! The accessories are all wonderful and all comely in the proportion of fine keeping. But it is the anointed and holy One for whom we sigh, as the spring, well-head, and centre of all the glories. We want the One who loved us with love stronger than death, who descended so low for our recovery, and washed our sins away by his precious blood, and gave us the charter of life eternal by his resurrection from the dead. The forests of eternity may be grand, the fields and rivers may be transcendent in favour and beauty undefiled: but the face of our Lord will be the true glory and charm of every landscape, and all things bright and fair will gather splendour and grace from his countenance. His face gives strength to the archangel, his voice awakens the dead, his presence secures the everlasting harmonies, and the never-fading BLOOM.

We read some time ago an article by a learned but not a wise man, who said, concerning our Lord, "He came providentially at such a time, he came spiritually at another time, he came figuratively at another time." Such men would turn the blood of atonement into a figure, and the truth of God into a fable. We never got quit of the heart-ache after the infliction until we turned to a magnificent passage in Hebrews, "But now ONCE in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself . . . . And unto them that look for him shall he appear the SECOND TIME without sin unto salvation." (Heb. ix.) How welcome such a clear, authentic voice from the source of authority? The dreamer may tell his dream, surely, but what is the chaff to the wheat? The word of the Lord is a fire and a hammer to break the rock in pieces.

ONCE in the confluence of the ages, or in the completion of the periods, he appeared to put away sin. Others, of slender human force, had tried to diminish the sum of that great burden and horror which is the shame, the anguish, and the ruin; but at last there came one of Divine force, strong enough, both to *put away* sin, and to *abolish* death. They may linger yet a season, but the iron has stricken into them, and in the end they will be thrust from the universe. Once he came, and in the mysterious sacrifice of love purged away our sins; and to them that look for him shall he appear a second time, apart from sin, unto the great salvation; that salvation concerning which a great Christian thinker once wrote, after he had long enjoyed the life divine in close communion with God, "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed." The passage is exceedingly comprehensive; for, while death and judgment are declared as solemn verities, the Lord delivers his people from the fear of both. He has taken away the sin which gave death a sting, in his first appearing, and in his second appearing he comes for the glory and salvation of the ransomed; hence, judgment

Digitized by Google

has no terror to those who, from mortality or death, are to shine in incorruption.

There is a passage in the letter of Paul to Titus which will repay a little consideration: "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." (Chap. ii. 11-13.)

When the ages or periods, which were not formless spectres of an atheistic dream, but missionaries from God, had delivered their messages and accomplished their work, there appeared the favour of God providing salvation for all men. "The dayspring from on high hath visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness and the shadow of death." One who was waiting for the consolation of Israel said, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel." (Luke ii. 29-32.) We learn from John i. that the Logos had been, through all former ages, the light in the darkness. Lights of nature, providence, or supernaturalism; lights of reason, conscience, imagination, or love; lights of sun, moon, or star; lights of old tradition, stone table, or human constitution; there was no lamp burning in the heavens or on the earth which he had not kindled and fed with his divine fire. But the darkness apprehended it not. So the Logos, or Word of God, took human shape and appeared to men with a richer and warmer revelation. No man hath seen God at any time, but the only begotten Son from the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. Surely the life was manifested, the eternal life, that men might get into communion with God the Father and with his divine and honourable Son. It is just at this point that human records begin to glow with divine significance, that we get a true philosophy of history, and from a living centre distinguish gracious plan in the past, and glorious promise in the future.

Between the two advents—the appearing in grace, and the appearing in glory—we are taught, or put under training, that we may live soberly, righteously, and godly, while looking for the blessed Hope. Soberly marks the dignity of men who escape from the frivolous pursuit of trifles and unrealities, to live with high purpose and resolute endeavour. Righteously determines the justice and equity which must mark all our transactions with the Jew, the Gentile, or the Church of God. Godly signifies such a flooding of the human with the divine, that we become distinguished by the love which distinguishes God. We no longer look on nature and humanity with the narrow vision or half-blind eyes of the flesh, but with the large eyes of gods who are made partakers of the divine nature. Once he appeared in grace to bring us home to a sin-pardoning and life-

Digitized by Google

giving God, to open our eyes and turn us from darkness to light, and give us an inheritance among the sanctified. A second time he will appear with the salvation of power, that we may shine out in immortality, and hear the triumphal music of the kingdom. A peculiar and disciplined people find the power, glory, and blessedness for which they have been aspiring and working under divine influences and the leading of the Holy Spirit. Many things in Christianity can be, and have been vulgarised; but immortality cannot be vulgarised, it is the reality of comely proportion, of grandeur, of supreme desire. That man with his regal intellect, his mysterious conscience, and his almost divine force of will should inherit the same corruption as the brutes is surely a miserable ending. Such a goal has a lameness about it which revolts, as well as a horror which no language may declare.

The philosophers who, in the rejection of Christianity, lose all hope or prospect of continuance or resurrection, have for some time been trying to make the horror presentable. They miserably fail. They can only promise a grand funeral, and draperies of gold and purple as curtains round the couch of everlasting darkness. What glory is it to the dead, who can neither see nor hear, that roses should blow and nightingales sing over the graves, or the southern wind linger over sepulchres after rifling spice fields on the way? We might as well have the gloom of midnight and eclipse, the north wind howling and roaring for ever, and all elemental forces of wrath and ruin making grim play with the bones and the dust of the dead. It is life and joy to know that our citizenship is in heaven, from whence we look for the divine One, who will change the body of our humiliation and fashion it like unto his own by the energy of his all-subduing power. The divine life which belongs to us is wisely veiled for a season, hid with Christ in God; but when he who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory.

"The Spirit and the bride say, Come." Their combined voices call the Lord back from the seat of his priesthood to the throne of his royal power. And surely the nations of the world in their inarticulate fashion call as loudly as martyrs under the altar, or Church in the wilderness. They are either getting into convulsion or getting into ghastly fear, on account of the things which are coming on the earth. And he, the God-man, who once, in Palestine, spake peace to wind and wave, is the only one who can control the wilder storm which agitates a deeper sea, and bring the vessel of humanity to the shores of eternal rest.

Digitized by Google

# A FEW MORE WORDS ON THEOLOGY.

I HAVE read with interest the paper, "On Theology," which appeared in the RAINBOW of this month. With the *conclusions* of the writer I am not disposed to differ. With his *definition* of what he justly terms "the science" of theology I do. If this be so mischievous a thing as he supposes it to be, and I am not inclined to dispute that it *is* so, it must be something *more* than "the study of divine things," whether through the intellect or through the heart; it *must* be something above and beyond Scripture, something human and not divine, or it could not be, under any circumstances, the source of "cruelties and horrors unspeakable."

If I were asked to define what I understand by theology, I should say it is the deduction of *supposed* truth from *revealed* truth—a purely human process—and therefore necessarily mixed with defect and error. Scripture is of God. Theology is of man. It is man reasoning and dogmatising, and attempting to systematise that which God has not been pleased to reveal *as a system*. When the result of his reasoning and systematising is made, as it always is made, *a test* of the reality and rightness of a man's belief, it necessarily alters at once both the nature and the grounds of faith. Faith, says St. Paul, is believing *with the heart* unto righteousness. Faith, says the consistent theologian, is *not only* this, it is the right intellectual conception of the truth professed to be believed, which can only be arrived at by systematising what God has revealed, and so viewing each separate truth in its relation to the rest. Hence, the orthodox theologian, not content with the simple acceptation of a revealed truth as it stands in Scripture, is always restless and unhappy until he has made it *fit in* with that particular system which he regards as alone consistent with the moral character of God.

Dr. Angus, than whom a more competent expositor of the term can scarcely be found, defines theology as "that *methodical interpretation* of Scripture, the result of which is systematic divinity." The late Professor Rogers entitles it "a systematised view of the facts respecting God and our relations to him, obtained by induction of the substantial contents of Revelation." These definitions, which are given by two eminent divines, when anxious *to contract* the functions of theology as much as possible, are perhaps as unobjectionable as any that can be found. *Both*, however, speak of theology as something *more* and different from the mere study of Scripture. The one says it is essentially *interpretation*, "the methodical interpretation of Scripture." The other affirms it to be a view of facts *obtained by induction*, which is again the human interpretation of Scripture, and therefore fallible. Need it then excite wonder that whenever these human processes are regarded as infallible, placed side by side with divine revelation, and *enforced*,

Digitized by Google

"cruelties and horrors unspeakable" must be the consequence,—a consequence which could never follow the mere "study of divine things" through the intellect alone. Rightly, therefore, is it affirmed that, "Not until men learn to throw off the authority of human theology, and to trust themselves, as it were, to God and his Word alone, will bright and hopeful views take possession of their hearts."

But how is this to be brought about? For, although it is clear as daylight that Christianity is not a theology, that the Scriptures were never constructed with a view to the preparation of one, yet is it equally clear that if Christianity was planted in the world *as a society* rather than an individual, influence, a theology is indispensable. Churches of whatever kind, the simplest as well as the most hierarchical, are necessarily founded on a theology. They could not exist without it. What are called churches in the New Testament did indeed do so, because of the miraculous conditions under which they were formed, taught, and governed; but no Church since the decease of the apostles has ever existed, or can, by any possibility, exist without a theology, by which I mean without *something more* than the possession of the Scriptures, without a common view expressed or understood—to borrow Professor Rogers' language—of such "facts respecting God and our relation to him as can be obtained *by induction* of the substantial contents of Revelation;" in other words, by a *human interpretation* of that which is divine.

How are we to get out of this? If theology be mischievous, Churches must be so also. If Churches *of any kind* be of God, theology must be so likewise, and the only question for us to consider, is whether *a given theology* is or is not Scriptural; whether a *given Church* is or is not the true Church? We must, in attempting to decide this, start by *assuming*, as almost all Christians now do, with or without evidence, that *some* form or other of church organisation, and *some* system or other of theology is essential to the spread and permanence of a faith which rests on the revelations of a Book singularly *unadapted* to the formation of any tabulated system of truth, distinguished by "almost entire absence of anything approaching to scientific accuracy," all "its statements of doctrine, if we except some of the apostolic epistles, being thrown together without order or exact definition."

My own belief is that churches, like their varying theologies, are *of man*, and not of God; and will, therefore, before the coming of the Lord, be "plucked up," like everything else that is not of God's planting. But I am open to correction, and invite remark.

* D.

---

Digitized by Google

# CHRIST'S MISSION TO HADES.

IN the great pending controversy on the destiny of the human race, in which the RAINBOW has taken so courageous and honourable a part, a good deal of importance has been attached by some of the advocates of "conditional immortality" to the fact that the early "fathers" generally, if not universally, regarded eternal life as a supernatural endowment rather than the natural heritage of man. Mr. White in his great work *Life in Christ*; Mr Constable, in his *Duration and Nature of Future Punishment*, and Mr Denniston in his *Perishing Soul*, have more particularly gone into this question, and given quotations from Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Theophilus, and Athanasius, which suffice fairly to establish their position.

Now we must confess that we are not ourselves disposed to pin our faith, on this or any other subject, on the opinions of the patristic writers: it does not materially strengthen our faith in the great truth of life in Christ, to find that these ancient writers held it, nor should we have been much concerned to find that they denied it. The chief value of their testimony is historical; it is of some interest and some importance to know that in the second and third centuries this glorious truth was as clearly seen and as openly confessed as it is by ourselves at the present day.

But, estimating patristic authority and opinion as we choose, it will hardly be denied that whatever weight may fairly be supposed to attach to their doctrine of conditional immortality, *an equal weight must attach to their doctrine of the conscious survival of the soul.* Now it is our object in this paper to show—as briefly as may be—that in the opinion of the early fathers the soul neither went out of existence nor lapsed into a state of unconsciousness at death. And this is clearly proved, we maintain, by their common doctrine of Christ's mission to hades, to vanquish the devil and either announce the completion of his mediatorial work to the saints of the earlier dispensation, or preach the Gospel to those who had died in ignorance thereof.

Of this doctrine Dr. Huidekoper, in his scarce and learned work on the subject,* says: "That a subject so prominent among the early Christians as this underworld mission should have been passed by without a word, or with scarcely a word, by leading ecclesiastical historians, is singular. . . . If we have evidence that the orthodox of the second and third centuries believed any proposition unanimously, we have evidence that they believed the following:—'Jesus Christ at his death went on a mission to the subterranean world.'"

---

* "*The Belief of the First Three Centuries concerning Christ's Mission to the Underworld.*" Boston: 1854. It is to this work we are indebted for the quotations from the fathers in this paper, which must be taken on Dr Huidekoper's authority.

Digitized by Google

Fundamentally the conception was this. Satan was the angel of death (Heb. ii. 14, 15); the Lord of the underworld or hades; and the ransom of Christ's flesh given "for the life of the world" (John vi. 54) *was paid not to God but to Satan.* Having submitted to death by the hands of Satan's agents, the Jews, the work was not accomplished—the conflict was simply transferred to Satan's special dominion hades, and there, in his own "house," the "strong man was bound" and captive humanity taken as a prey. Thus Origen, quoting 1 Pet. i. 18, 19, writes: "If therefore we were bought with a price, we were bought doubtless from some one whose slaves we were, and who demanded such a price as he pleased for the release of those whom he held. It was the devil, however, who held us, to whom we had been allotted (or into whose power we had been dragged), by our sins. He therefore demanded as our price the blood of Christ."*

And again: alluding to Matt. xii. 29, and Luke xi. 21, 22,—"Christ voluntarily 'emptied himself and took the place of a servant,' and suffered the rule of the tyrant, 'being made obedient unto death,' by which death he destroyed 'him that had the dominion of death, that is the devil,' that he might liberate those who were held by death. For, having bound the strong one, he went into his house, into the house of death, into the underworld, and thence plundered his goods; that is, carried off the souls which he held, . . . and thence 'ascending on high, led captive the captives.'"†

But this doctrine—which stands in startling contrast to the modern evangelical theory of the atonement—was much older than Origen. Justin Martyr speaks of Christ as having, "for the salvation of such as believed on him, endured humiliation and suffering, that by dying and rising again he might conquer death."‡

And again: "The Messiah, this Son of God, who existed before the morning star and moon, yet being incarnated, endured to be born of this virgin from the race of David, that through this economy the serpent, who from the beginning did wickedly, and the angels who have become like him, might be routed, and death be humbled, and at the second coming of Christ wholly lose his power over those who believe on him (Jesus) and live acceptably; finally ceasing to exist (i.e., Satan), when some shall be sent for punishment to the condemnation of eternal fire, and others shall live together in a state of immortality, free from suffering, corruption, and grief."§

But it is Irenæus who more especially dilates on the Saviour's victory over Satan. "He wrestled and conquered," he says, "for he was a man contending for the fathers, . . . he bound the strong one and set loose the weak." . . . "For if a man had not

---

* *In Rom.* lib. ii. § 13.
† *Comment in Rom.* lib. vi. 10.
‡ Apol. I. c. 63.
§ *Dialogue* c. 45.

Digitized by Google

conquered the enemy of mankind, that enemy would not have been justly conquered." And again: "For if that man who had been formed by God that he might live, after having lost his life here, through the injury sustained from the serpent which had corrupted him, had no more returned to life . . . God would have been conquered, (but) . . . he by the second man bound the strong one, and spoiled his goods, and abolished death, vivifying that man (Adam) who had been rendered dead . . . so that he who had led man captive was justly in his turn taken captive by God; but man who had been led captive was freed from the chains of condemnation." . . . "Adam had been conquered, all life (immortality) being taken from him; therefore, the enemy being in turn conquered, Adam received life, . . . his salvation is the abolition of death. Therefore, when the Lord vivified man, that is, when he vivified Adam, death was abolished." . . . "The Lord steadfastly bound him (Satan) as his fugitive, and plundered his goods, that is, the men who were detained by him, and whom he used unjustly. And with justice was he led captive who had led man captive unjustly, but man . . . was drawn out from the power of his possessor."*

It is unnecessary to multiply quotations, inasmuch as it is not our present purpose to inquire into the truth or error of this ancient teaching, though we may remark in passing that it seems to harmonise very closely with the language of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (chap. ii. 14, 15), and is fully embodied in the fine old Latin hymn, which in an English dress is—thanks to "*Hymns Ancient and Modern*"—now so familiar to many of us:—

"The strife is o'er, the battle done;
The triumph of the Lord is won;
O let the song of praise be sung.

"The powers of death have done their worst,
But JESUS hath his foes dispersed;
Let shout of joy and praise outburst.

"On that third morn he rose again,
In glorious majesty to reign;
O let us swell the joyful strain.

"He closed the yawning gates of hell (*hades*);
The bars from heaven's high portals fell;
Let songs of joy his triumphs tell!"

Let it be noted, then, that this whole doctrine involves the apparently unquestioned assumption of the continued conscious existence of the soul of Christ, in which he thus descended into hades for the overthrow of its dread prince and the deliverance of his brethren from the power of death; if not also of the continued conscious existence of those whom he thus delivered. On the latter point, however, we find much clearer evidence when we proceed to

* *Contra Hæres, passim.*

Digitized by Google

consider, as we may now do, the object of Christ's mission to hades in relation to the human souls held captive therein. As to this a considerable difference of opinion existed, which does not, however, affect the point before us. "On leaving the apostolic age," says Dr. Huidekoper, "we almost lose sight of the Christians in an historical chasm of sixty or eighty years. When they reappear on the hither side of it, we find, so far as their records enable us to judge, that, among all the parties into which they are divided, a belief has become firmly established that Christ performed a mission in the underworld." But, if so, had he any object, apart from the redemption of men from the power of the devil, and, if so, what was that object? It is impossible for us, even if it were expedient, to go into the many differences of opinion which are found to have existed on this question; but it may be broadly stated, that while some (the more rigidly orthodox) maintained that our Lord's object was to preach the Gospel to the just men and saints of the Mosaic dispensation only, the more liberally minded supposed this evangelisation to include some or all of the Gentiles who had not the law. Of the former class was Justin Martyr, who writes, quoting the 22nd Psalm: "'Our fathers hoped on thee, they hoped on thee, and *thou didst liberate them;* they cried to thee and were not disappointed;' (this portion of the Psalm) manifests that these fathers also confessed him who had hoped on and were saved by God,—he (Christ, who is regarded as the speaker) himself indicating that he was to be saved by the same God, and not boasting that he could do anything by his own counsel or strength. *For upon earth he did the same.*"*

To Trypho the Jew, he says again, "From thewords of Jeremiah (spurious) they (the Jews) have in like manner erased the following: 'The Lord God remembered his dead from among Israel, who had fallen asleep under the earth of the sepulchre, and descended to them that he might announce to them his salvation.'"†

So Irenæus tells us: "Therefore the Lord descended to the regions under the earth, preaching to them also his advent, the sins of such as believed on him being remitted. But all believed on him who *were hoping for him,* that is, who had *foretold his coming and obeyed his statutes,* the just men, *the prophets and patriarchs,* to whom he remitted their sins in like manner as to us." And elsewhere he states as the object of Christ's death, "That he might announce the glad tidings to *Abraham and those who were with him.*"‡

A passage in the smaller Greek epistles attributed to Ignatius coincides in tone with these quotations: "How shall we live without Him whom *the prophets—being his disciples* through the Spirit —looked for as their teacher (i.e., in hades). And on this account he whom they justly expected, being come, waked them from the

* *Dial.* c. 99. † *Dial.* c. 99. *Cont. Hæres,* iv. 27, 2; v. 33, 1.

Digitized by Google

dead."* And, in like manner, Tertullian says that "Christ did not ascend the heights of heaven before he had 'descended into the lower parts of the earth,' that there he might make the *patriarchs and prophets* participators of himself."†

By the more liberal of the fathers, however, a wider range was given to the divine evangelisation, so as to include a part or the whole of the heathen. Thus Clement of Alexandria, endeavouring to support himself by an appeal to Hermas, says: "The shepherd by speaking simply of '*those who had fallen asleep*' recognises some as just men among the Gentiles and Jews, (and thus includes) not only such as preceded the Lord's coming, but those *prior to the law*, who were well pleasing to God, as Abel, Noah, or any other just man. . . . 'For when the Gentiles, not having the law, do by nature what the law requires, though they have not the law, they are a law unto themselves,' according to the Apostle." Elsewhere he argues as follows: "To those who were just according to the law, faith was wanting . . . to the just according to philosophy, not only faith in the Lord, but abstinence from idolatry was needful. Wherefore the Lord preached to those in the underworld; for, according to the Scripture, 'The underworld says to destruction, We have not, indeed, seen his form, but we have heard his voice.' It was not the place which, after listening to his voice, spoke the foregoing, but those (without distinction of race) who were in the underworld. . . . These are they who attended to the divine voice and power. For what reasonable man would brand Providence with injustice, by deeming the souls of just men (from among the Gentiles) and sinners (of all nations) under one condemnation? What! Do not the Scriptures manifest that the Lord preached the Gospel to those who perished in the deluge,—or rather to such as had been bound, and to those in prison and custody? It has been shown (by me) in the second book of Stromata, that the Apostles, in imitation of the Lord, preached the Gospel to those in the underworld. For there also, as here, I think it behoved the best of the disciples to be imitators of their Teacher, that the one should lead to conversion the Hebrews, and the other the Gentiles; that is, such of both as had lived according to the justice of the law or of philosophy, not perfectly indeed but imperfectly.

"If the sole cause of the Lord's descent to the underworld was to preach the Gospel,—as descend he certainly did,—it was either that he might preach it to all, or to the Hebrews alone. But if to all, then all who believed will be saved, even if they should be from among the Gentiles, seeing that they have already heartily confessed him there. . . . But if he preached the Gospel to the Jews alone, to whom the knowledge and faith which come by the Saviour were wanting, it is manifest that, as God is no respecter of external

* Magnesians, c. 9. † De Anima, c. 55.

Digitized by Google

distinctions, the apostles there also, as here, must have preached to such of the Gentiles as were fitted for conversion."*

Origen, the pupil of Clement, as might be expected, stretches this limit even to universality. He regarded the benefits of Christ's death as not even confined to mankind, but extending to all rational creatures. In a passage referring especially to mankind, however, he tells us that "Christ gave his soul a ransom for the many who believed on him (Matt. xx. 28), and if a belief of all upon him were supposable, he would have given his soul a ransom for all;" and adds, that in the underworld "*all who wished to follow him* from among death's prisoners could do so."† Again: Celsus having objected: "You of course do not confess touching him (i.e., Christ) that, having failed to convince men here, he betook himself to the underworld to convince those there." Origen replies, with some warmth: "We will, however, say this, though he (Celsus) may not like it; that while in the body Christ convinced not a few (only) but so many that, on account of the multitude of believers, a plot was laid against him, and (then) with a soul divested of its body he discoursed to souls divested of their bodies, converting to himself such as were willing, or those whom for reasons known to himself he recognised as disposed unto salvation."‡

Arnobius wrote at a later period. In his work *Against the Heathen* he represents them as asking, "If Christ was sent by God that he might free unhappy souls from destruction, what have former generations deserved, who by the condition of mortality passed away before his advent?" Arnobius answers: "Can you know what has been done for the souls of former times? whether to them also, by some method determined on and foreseen, assistance has been given? Can you, I say, know that which could be known if Christ were your teacher, . . . whether they would have been permitted to die unless Christ at a fixed time had come to their assistance as a preserver? Lay aside these cares and dismiss questions which you do not understand. To them also royal mercy *has been* imparted, and the divine benefits have equally flowed on all. They have been preserved. They have been liberated, and have laid aside the lot and condition of mortality."§

The writings of Marcion the Gnostic—who was much less of a monster than he has been painted—have perished; but Irenæus tells us: "Besides (Marcion's) blasphemy against (the Jewish) God, he added this, receiving indeed a mouth from the devil, and speaking all things contrary to the truth; that Cain and those who were like him, and the Sodomites and Egyptians, and those who were like them, and in fact all the Gentiles who had walked in thorough wickedness, were saved by the Lord when he descended

---

* *Strom.* ii. 9; vi. 6.
† *Comment in Matt.* tom. xvi.
‡ *Cont. Celsum*, ii. 43.
§ *Adv. Gentes*, ii. 68.

Digitized by Google

into the underworld, and that they had hastened to him, and that he took them into his kingdom."*

From these quotations, then, the catena of which might be indefinitely extended, it is very obvious, that whatever may have been their opinion on other subjects such as the true penalty of sin, or the conditions of immortality, the continued conscious existence of the soul through and after death was never with these early Christians an open question. Gnostic and anti-Gnostic, orthodox and latitudinarian alike believed it. All men at death descended into hades—that dark subterranean region of which Satan was king—and thither Christ in the interval between his death and resurrection descended to proclaim the glad tidings of his great salvation, to some or to all of its inhabitants. Indeed, says Dr. Huidekoper, "at the Christian era, popular phraseology would have made little distinction between the fact of man's death, and the idea of his descent to the lower regions. The latter was regarded as implied in the former. When Peter quotes (Acts ii. 27, 31) from the Psalm in evidence that God would not leave Christ's soul in hades, he makes no effort to prove that he ever descended there. This was an inference which his hearers would probably have regarded as necessarily involved in his death. It needed no proof."

W. MAUDE.

4, Kingsdown Road, Upper Holloway, N.

---

## "THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY COME TO PASS."

REVELATION i. 1.

No. III.

*(Continued from February.)*

THIS question of *readiness* is one upon which the conscience of the faithful has been exercised to some extent of late years, and we doubt not that it has been the stirring of the Spirit of God within them. It is now more than forty years ago that two sections of the Christian Church originated what has since become two sects, if not more, and, alas, for their common faith in one Master, they have grown as arrogant in their pretensions and intolerant of others—but especially of each other—as any of the systems they left behind. Good men that they were, they had obtained a light beyond their fellows upon the subject of the Lord's coming; they thought, and rightly thought, that it behoved them to be ready for that coming; but, strange to tell, they sought that readiness in two exactly opposite directions.

---

* *Cont. Hæres*, i. 27, 3.

Digitized by Google

Commencing with the life-testimony of the sainted Edward Irving (who, between 1822 and 1828, became the voice of the Lord, not to the City of London only, but to his own and to succeeding generations, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight," and having delivered his message, "fell on sleep," in the close of 1834, until his Lord should come), the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church has been, in *its* way, making ready for the returning Bridegroom. This section of the British Church professes to have had from heaven, by inspired apostles and prophets of its own communion, the command, "Awake, awake; put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem. Shake thyself from the dust, and arise;" and now for a long time has regarded, and wished others to regard, in its Church-witness, the words fulfilled, "His wife hath made herself ready." (Rev. xix. 7.) But what have we seen to be the state of things under the "restored apostles?" Men, good men, doubtless many, professing to bestow the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of their hands; yet withal we must ask, *Has* it produced men of power, recognised as such beyond the pale of their own church? Forms, ceremonies, offices, and office-bearers in abundance, an elaborate and imposing ritual, with many-coloured vestments, incense, and ever-burning lamp in their temple, yet, what is it all but Aaron with the name of Christ? How far beyond its own communion has its witness been heard, or known, or felt?

But the other section which is now known among us as Plymouth Brethrenism took the opposite direction, and (to adopt its own *vernacular*) met simply as brethren round the person of the Lord Jesus, gathering on New Testament ground, assembling on the first day of the week to break bread simply in the name of the Lord Jesus. How far this movement, which took place some forty years ago, was of the Lord, the day of the Lord must declare; but this much will we say in their behalf as our own conviction concerning them, that no body of believers in modern time stood fairer for testimony against apostasy from primitive simplicity than did these in their *outset*. But certain, as sad, it is that J. N. Darby and B. W. Newton, its prime movers, soon parted company and became *de facto* apostles of the two rival factions, as they continue to this present time, under the several technicalities of *open* and *close* communions. Still, we must insist that at their commencement they became equally pronounced with the Catholic Apostolic Church upon pre-millenarian truth, and the required fitness to meet the Lord. Whereupon we found them giving prominence to such passages as these: "Come out and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you," &c.; and again, "Come out of her my people, come out of her (Babylon) that ye partake not of her sins, that ye receive not of her plagues." "*Babylon*," to them, expressed all sects and denominations *but their own*. Another famous quotation with them was, "Cease to do evil, learn to do well," and their interpretation of it was, *Cease* to recognise the one-



Digitized by Google

man-ministry, and *learn* to meet on New Testament ground as brethren and sisters in Christ. But what has it come to after forty years' trial? A section of the Church numbering considerably the largest percentage of genuine believers, earnest and devout students of the Bible, and some among them—their leaders especially—able critics and scholars in Hebrew and Greek, but divided among themselves into two, three, or more sections, altogether intolerant of other sects, but most of all intolerant of each other, unloving and unlovely as any that can be found among Protestant Christians. Thus has their testimony among the systems been marred, and their power, as a system to produce and proclaim *readiness*, as effete as others. Yet before God, and apart from their system, many, we doubt not, are ready to enter in with their Lord when he shall return to the wedding.

Christadelphianism, too, has of late been asserting itself somewhat as a section of the Christian Church "looking for his appearing." But when we find it insisting upon baptism by immersion as essential to salvation, what can we think of its notion of readiness for the appearing?

Wherein then *does* readiness consist? Not in *holding* Second Advent truth, not in *advocating* it, not in *preaching* it. This doctrine, no more than any other held in sentiment only, affects our state Godward, while readiness consists in a right state Godward. Many are found to-day, and many will be found at his appearing, sound in their sentiment of the truth, and, perhaps, loud in their proclamation of it, who, nevertheless, weighed in the balances as to their state Godward, will be found wanting in readiness. Some have been holding it and preaching it for years, who have so declined in their testimony that it is evident they have gone to sleep over it. Interrogate them on the subject and they will be found holding it still. Others have shelved the subject altogether, and, for fear of giving offence or of suffering reproach, keep it to themselves, and say nothing about it.

We knew one good man, a minister, who, after preaching it for years, had offer of a charge where the late minister opposed the doctrine, and so did the surviving deacons; and this good man could only accept the vacant charge upon the understanding that he was to keep in abeyance his special views on this subject. The church was old-established, the salary was a "*rise*," the neighbourhood was respectable, country exchanged for London, and the young family growing up about him becoming expensive. What should he do? *Was* it imperative he should preach Second Advent truth? The Lord might *yet* tarry awhile. What *should* he do? The parley was listened to, the bait took, the charge was accepted, and what became of it? The Church was soon divided. The ministry was lamely fulfilled. The good man lived in bondage, and died in the dark, with a bad conscience. Will he rise to enter into the joy of his Lord? We think not. (See Matt. xxv. 21, 23; 1 Tim. iii. 13.)

Digitized by Google

A good man, a saved man, doubtless, but not the good and faithful servant that will "have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his appearing." Wherein then consists readiness, we ask again, that we may answer it finally and conclusively? In one or other of three conditions, if not all combined—

1st. In having the lamp trimmed and burning.

2nd. In going out to meet the Bridegroom, and uniting with those who raise the cry.

3rd. In enduring until he comes.

The lamp trimmed and burning. What is this? Oil enough and to spare, no corroding care, or lust, to hinder the brightness of our testimony, vigilance over our own state—that walking ourselves in the light we may be lights to others; in the meekness and gentleness of Christ loved and loving, tender to charge with wrong, and free to forgive wrongs done; a heart at leisure from itself to soothe and sympathise wherever and whenever needed; blameless and harmless, the sons of God without rebuke in evil times and circumstances.

Going out to meet the Bridegroom, and uniting with those who raise the cry—What is this? Looking for a city which hath foundations, and therefore not nestling here; accounting our present state one of *espousals*, having Christ for our Bridegroom and his Father's house for our home; awake to the blessed fact of his promise to come and fetch us, and reminding others of it too; with our affections so set on things above, that where our treasure is our heart may be also; and going out of the honour and respect of the world into the reproach of Christ the coming One. And *that*,

By enduring until he comes. What is this? Not for a season only, not while the fit is upon us, not while the subject is novel and the prospects exciting; but *all* the while he tarries. How long the ten virgins who started together held on their way together we are not told. But we are told that while the Bridegroom tarried they all slumbered and slept, and this is the testing time for all, and the words, "I appoint unto you a *kingdom*," will be the sequel of, "Ye are they which have *continued* with me in my temptations." Readiness, then, consists in a *state*, not what we think, nor what we believe, nor what we preach, but what we *are* before him who judgeth righteous judgment.

Having thus fully considered what it is to be ready, and having searched our own hearts with the inquiry, Am I ready? let us pass on to consider the rapture, and, as well as we are able, its results. For that "*moment*," spoken of by the apostle in 1 Cor. xv. 52, must become presently *realised* by millions of our race. Something unprecedented in the world's history must soon take place, and we shall lose nothing, but possibly make a gain by attempting to realise the result consequent upon the rapture, first to them that are *taken*, and next to them that are *left*. Concerning them that are taken but little can be said. The apostle is content with saying, "And so shall we ever be with the Lord." What is



Digitized by Google

expressed in the words "with the Lord," not only does language fail to utter, but the imagination fails to conceive. To be "caught away with them (the raised ones) in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air," and seeing him to be made like him, is altogether beyond human conception. Well might John say, "We know not what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him," and so much as we can grasp of that suffices us to know. Whatever we may fail to conceive of, and there is much of detail that we cannot attempt to touch even in thought, this much is certain, that while surprise will certainly overtake many, regrets there can be none. The battle of life suddenly ended, the cross laid by for a crown, will admit of no regrets; for "Glory, glory dwelleth in Emanuel's land." Regrets there can be none, that is most certain; but this leads necessarily to reflection upon the relative ties and dependents of those who share in the rapture. We have it from the lips of our blessed Lord, "Two men shall be in the field, one shall be taken and the other left." Let us suppose, then, that the one taken will be the landed proprietor or tenant of the field, and that at the homestead there will be a wife and several young children. What, then, shall be the portion of these? Now, Scripture not only joins the man to his wife, and calls them one, but the children, too, are so much part and parcel of ourselves that the man's household becomes identified with the man for good or ill, and hence, we find oft repeated in Scripture, "Thou and thy house." (See Gen. vii. 1; Jer. xxxviii. 17; Acts xi. 14.; xvi. 31.) We cannot, therefore, conceive that Infinite Wisdom, who is also Infinite Love, will leave the children exposed to the storm of tribulation which must then immediately ensue, when their natural protector and provider is taken away, or that he being so taken away could be free from care and regret if they were left behind. Under this consideration we infer that the children of *tender* age, such as are irresponsible for their state Godward, and dependent upon the parents, will share the rapture with him. How the case may be with the wife may depend upon the measure of sympathy or subjection in which she has been to her husband. If an enemy of the truth or careless about her state Godward, she *may* find herself bereaved of both husband and children. Again, let us suppose that "the other left" in the field has in his homestead a wife in readiness for her Lord's coming, and together with her little ones has been caught away at the same moment that he missed his friend. He will return to his house to report that some strange thing has happened, when, to his amazement, he finds his home empty and the servants in consternation to know what has become of mistress and the children. And possibly one of the servants, the least esteemed in the homestead, and the most put upon, is gone too. Moreover, we learn from our blessed Lord, that "Two women shall be grinding at the mill," possibly fellow-servants, the one reviling, the other enduring for his name's sake, whose coming she an-

Digitized by Google

ticipates, the one reckoning on her earthly prospects, the other looking for her Lord from heaven. No wonder that one is taken and the other left, and where will be her reviling then?

"In that night also there shall be two men in one bed," possibly brothers in one family, and fellow Christians too. Ere they fall asleep one may be found saying to the other, "Who knows but the Lord may come before morning! How delightful to wake and find oneself 'for ever with the Lord!'" To which the other may respond, "Ah, there you are again, riding your favourite hobby; *I* expect to live and die and be buried many long years before then." What wonder that the one should be taken while the other is left?

In like manner we might extend our thought to the exchange, the market place, the crowded hospital, the lonesome sick room, or the thronged thoroughfare, where two shall be speaking together, walking together, negotiating some more or less important business matter together; when lo, in a moment, one is gone and the other remains alone. Or it may happen when believers are gathered at the table of the Lord, remembering him until he come, and we have often thought it *may* be the happy experience of some to be overtaken at such a time. But what empty spaces may be seen then! The minister, with one or two of the deacons, and a score or two of the members *gone*, while the rest are left in blank astonishment to self-examination and inquiry whether, after all, they have known anything savingly or whether their faith has been fancy only. In other cases possibly the minister and the deacons, with the bulk of the congregation, may be *left* to see that those two or three among them that held strange pre-millenarian views, and were always talking about the importance of being ready, were, after all, right, while the rest were wrong. Then, truly, "In the divisions of Reuben, there *shall* be great searchings of heart." (Judges v. 16.) The High Court of Parliament may be at the time assembled, and a lively debate on in the House of Commons, when a "division" shall take place without being called for, and of a kind never before known. Whether the House of Peers or the Bench of Bishops would be invaded, whether the reigning sovereign or any members of the royal family or household would share in the visitation the day must declare. But certain it is that thus the seal of divine approbation will be set upon the approved ones in that day without regard for station, caste, or creed, for "*They* shall be mine, saith the Lord of Hosts in that day, when I make up my special treasure, and I will value them as a man valueth his own son that serveth him." (Mal. iii. 17.) Let us then be of the number who daily say, "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory." (Psalm lxxiii. 24.)

But now we must consider the subjects of the "*first* resurrection" as sharers together with us in the rapture.

Hackney. N. STARKEY.

*(To be continued.)*

Digitized by Google

## ABIDING WITH GOD.

1 Cor. vii. 20.

"LET every one, whate'er his calling be,
Therein abide with God." So wrote of old
Saint Paul to them at Corinth, and to me,
With loving speech to-night this word was told.
I had grown weary with my strifes and cares,
And murmured o'er the service of the day,
Wherein I had forgotten, unawares,
That thus I still might noblest service pay.

"Abide with God." Would I might ne'er forget,
That evermore I may with him abide.
What matter how or where the stamp is set,
Or what the furnace where the gold is tried,
So that the metal has the sterling ring,
So that the likeness of the King is shown?
God's coinage still, that to the soul may bring
Such wealth as merchant princes have not known.

In market places where the race is swift,
And competition on temptation waits;
In quiet home where unseen currents drift
A thousand petty cares through open gates;
Let each and all, whate'er the calling be,
Therein abide with God from break of day
Till set of sun; they shall his purpose see,
And serve him still in his appointed way.

So let me see and serve, and thus abide:
Not simply patient, or at best content;
Not with eye-service, in which, love denied,
In rounds of duty dreary days are spent.
Give me, O Lord, a joy that is divine;
Touch thou my lips with constant themes of praise;
Since, having thee, all things I need are mine,
Whate'er my lot, whate'er my length of days.

* A. D. F. Randolph.

---

## CHERUBIC PHENOMENA.

By William Morris, M.D.

FOURTH SECTION.

*The Apocalyptic Cherubim.*

OUR present theme is more complex and comprehensive than either of the preceding: and it necessitates a notice of the Apocalypse as a whole, and of certain parts in particular. For it is not possible to expound the apocalyptic cherubim, excepting as an integral part of the vision of the throne; and it is expedient to notice other visions also, by reason of their intimate relation to that of the throne.

Digitized by Google

The Apocalypse has been called "The Book of the Throne." Several particulars, including the style of the salutation, mark the difference of its characteristics and design from those of the apostolic epistles. Its general character is governmental, rather than gracious. But intimations of the eternal purpose of God the Father, in his Son, occasionally shine out, especially in the parts relating to final results, and which direct the mind of the believer to the gratuitous immortality to be conferred on those who have been redeemed unto God, "out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation."

The elemental parts and scenic representations are derived from, or are based upon, a variety of facts and of revelations recorded in the previous books of the Bible; more especially the sacred history of Israel, and the notices therein of the people and kingdoms implicated in the sins, vicissitudes, and sufferings of that nation.

Moreover, it is assumed that the reader of the book is acquainted with the records and revelations concerning the past and the future of Israel; and also with the teaching of the Lord and his apostles, respecting "the church of the firstborn, who are enrolled in the heavens."

The inspired title of the book is, "The Revelation of Jesus Christ." The original phrase—Ἀποκαλύψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—is repeatedly used in the writings of the apostles, to denote the promised return and glorious manifestation of the Lord Jesus. As the title of the book it has a related, but not an identical, meaning. In other words, it signifies *a dramatic manifestation or representation of the personal perfections, the historic acts, the official relations, the governmental prerogatives and powers, and the future triumphs of* Jesus Christ.

1. Recording his first vision, the apostle says, "I saw seven golden lampstands, and in the midst of the lampstands, one like a human being,* clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girded about the breasts with a golden girdle. His head and the hairs, white like wool, as white as snow, and his eyes as a flame of fire, and his feet like fine copper, as if they glowed in a furnace, and his voice as the sound of many waters. And he had in his right hand seven stars, and out of his mouth went a keen two-edged sword, and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his power. And when I saw him I fell at his feet as dead, and he laid his right hand on me, saying: Fear not; I am the First and the Last, and the Living One, and became dead; and behold, I am alive unto the ages of the ages; and have the keys of hades and of death."

The form and particular characteristics of this vision are based on the presence of the high priest of Israel in the holy place, inspecting the condition of the lamps on the seven-branched golden lampstand. It represents the episcopal relation or supreme headship of the Lord Jesus, and describes him as inspecting, and morally judging, the condition of the apostolic churches.

2. The next revelation of Jesus Christ—external to the vision of the throne—is made by means of an angelic appearance, thus: "And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer, and much incense was given to him, that he should add it to the prayers of

* The phrase *ὅμοιον υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου* is not here used as an appellation. It simply means, like a human being.

Digitized by Google

all saints upon the golden altar, which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, with the prayers of the saints, ascended before God out of the angel's hand. And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it upon the earth; and there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake."

The basis of this vision is the presence and action of the high priest in the holy place of the tabernacle, and at the golden altar, burning incense before the LORD.

The angel and his official act represent the priesthood of the Lord Jesus, and the presentation of the prayers of all saints by him to God the Father, with the moral fragrance of his own holiness, and of his own sacrifice; as it is written: "Who hath given himself on our behalf an offering and sacrifice to God, unto an odour of a pleasant fragrance."

The basis of the vision includes also an assumed action of the high priest, as if going out of the holy place, taking fire from the altar in the sacred court, and then going forth and casting the fire outside the camp. And in this particular the vision relates to a time of fierce persecution, and to the execution of retributive justice on the persecutors, when "God shall avenge his own elect."

3. Another revelation of Jesus Christ is made in this manner: "And I saw another mighty angel come down out of the heaven, clothed with a cloud: and a rainbow over and around his head, and his face was as the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire: and he had in his hand a little book open. And he set his right foot on the sea, and his left on the earth, and cried out with a great voice, as when a lion roareth: and when he had cried out, seven thunders uttered their voices. And when the seven thunders had uttered their voices, I was about to write: and I heard a voice out of the heaven saying to me, Seal up those things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not. And the angel which I saw standing upon the sea and upon the earth lifted up his right hand towards the heaven, and sware by him who liveth unto the ages of the ages, who created the heaven, and the things which are therein, and the earth, and the things which are therein, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that delay should be no longer; but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when about to sound, the mystery (*secret*) of God shall be fully developed, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets."

The marvellous angel seen in this vision represents the Divine glory and supreme Lordship of Jesus Christ. The vision is both symbolic and prophetic of the assertion and vindication of HIS RIGHT to the possession of the earth and dominion of the world; and the assertion of HIS RIGHT is shown to be founded on his immortality, and his being the Creator of all things.

The threefold revelation of Jesus Christ which we have now received bears a direct relation to the vision of the throne, with the elders and the cherubim: and with that all-comprehensive vision is our chief and present concern.

Commencing the record of that vision, the apostle alludes to the first which he had seen, and says: "After this I looked, and behold, a door was opened in the heaven: and the voice which I heard at the first was as a trumpet talking with me, saying, Come up here, and I will show

Digitized by Google

thee things which must be hereafter. And immediately I was in the spirit: and, behold, a throne set in the heaven, and one sat on the throne. And he who sat was, to look upon, like a jasper and a sardine stone: and around the throne (*above*) was a rainbow, in sight like unto an emerald. And around the throne were four and twenty thrones, and sitting on the thrones were four and twenty elders, clothed in white raiment; and upon their heads were chaplets—στεφάνους—of gold. And out of the throne proceeded lightnings and thunderings and voices; and there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven spirits of God. And before the throne was a translucent sea (*laver*) like unto crystal: and in the circle of the throne were four living ones, full of eyes before and behind. And the first living one was like a lion, and the second living one like a young beeve, and the third living one had a face as a man, and the fourth living one was like a flying eagle. And the four living ones had each of them six wings around, and they were full of eyes within, and day and night they have no rest, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God the Almighty, who* was, and who is, and who is to come. And when these living ones give glory and honour to him who sitteth on the throne, who liveth unto the ages of the ages, the twenty-four elders fall down before him who sitteth on the throne and worship him who liveth unto the ages of the ages, and cast their chaplets before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive the glory, and the honour, and the power; for thou hast created all things, and on account of thy pleasure they exist and were created."

The vision of the throne, with its accessories and accompaniments, consists of three parts; and the first part must be first considered; for, otherwise, the exposition would be overburdened with the many particulars, and might rather embarrass than inform.

The scene of the vision is based on the arrangements of the tabernacle or the temple, but with certain very significant differences: there is no separating veil between the most holy place and the holy, nor between the latter and the sacred court. All is open to the view. The objects also are, in certain particulars, different, and the *cosmos*, or order of those which correspond, is not the same.

Before we proceed certain particulars, that may be termed the first principles of a correct exposition, must be laid down; and throughout must be borne in mind.

1. That God the Father, in whom the absoluteness of Deity subsists, has never been manifested to the senses of men; neither has he ever been, in any manner, to the ideality of the human mind; nor has his presence ever been *localised*, or, in any respect, circumscribed.

2. That every manifestation of Deity, from the beginning of the world, has been made in and by the Divine person who in the fulness of time became incarnate—the Son of the Virgin Mary—and was known

---

* The original of this title of Jesus Christ is an interpretation of his Hebrew title, *Y'hoh-vah or Y'hah-veh.* ("Jehovah.") The radical form of that divine name is *Yah*, and signifies HE WHO IS, and thus represents the idea of self-existence or essential being; and therefore includes the idea and fact that HE WAS; and *Y'hah-veh* means HE WHO WILL BE OR WHO WILL BECOME. Hence the Greek interpretation: ὁ ἦν και ὁ ὢν και ὁ ἐρχόμενος:—He "who was, and who is, and who is to come."

Digitized by Google

among men by the human name of JESUS, and made known to faith as being "the Christ, the Son of the living God."

3. That the entire character of the vision is intensely dramatic; and that its *seemingly* living forms are *not in any instance persons*, but are *personifications*.

4. That the vision of the throne, with the elders and the cherubim, is the fundamental and all-comprehensive "revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him:" and in this manner accomplished, *in part*, the prayer of his Son: "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee."

Keeping these facts in view, we proceed to expound.

*a*. The description given of the occupant of the throne is intensely symbolic. We are merely told that "he was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone." It is well known that these were the last and the first of the precious stones in the breastplate of the high priest; and in the vision they are inclusive of the twelve, on which were engraven the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. And in the view of the entranced apostle, the hues of the jasper and sardine formed a nebulous brilliancy, which was the *cognisance* of the veiled Monarch, and showed him to be the historic King of Israel, and the theme of ancient prophecy, as it was said, "He shall be a priest upon his throne;"—the King whose glory Isaiah saw in vision, and whom Nathaniel saw in humiliation and confessed, saying, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel."*

*b*. The mantling ornament of the throne—a rainbow, "in sight like unto an emerald"—denotes the Mediatorship of Jesus Christ in relation to the Covenant of Providence and the grant of temporal good and blessing on the human race. The rainbow is the token and pledge of that covenant; which was established on the fore-appointed sacrifice of Christ; and the administration of which is committed to him.

The rainbow, as seen by John, is exceedingly significant. It was "in sight like unto an emerald." Instead of the seven prismatic hues, one only was seen: and in ancient and sacred hieroglyphics the green colour signified *Divine condescension*. As displayed in the rainbow and in the solar spectrum, it is the union of the blue and the yellow, and cannot be analysed. The blue signifies benignity or love, and the yellow appreciable excellence, and manifestive moral glory: and the union of these perfections is manifest in the condescension of Jesus Christ when he had become man, and in his providential administration on behalf

* The Lord Christ ascended from the Mount of Olives, as the rejected King of Israel, and Lord of the whole earth. And then was fulfilled the prophetic testimony of David in the 110th Psalm: "The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool." The fulfilment of this prediction is frequently noticed in the Christian Scriptures, and in such words as these: "We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." Bearing in mind that the presence of God the Father is not localised nor limited, it will be perceived that the meaning of the prophecy cited and the notices of its fulfilment is that, God the Father has invested his risen and ascended Son, Jesus Christ, with supreme authority, dominion, and glory in the heavens, "angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him." And the vision of the throne, now within view, is a dramatic embodiment of that cardinal form of divine truth, showing that the Father has glorified his Son.

Digitized by Google

of a sinful world. "He is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works."

*c.* The twenty-four elders, robed in white, adorned with chaplets of gold, and sitting on thrones around, and on a level with, the centre throne, remind us of "the elders of Israel," and their senatorial office and relations. From the wilderness of Arabia, and onward, they were the judicial council of the nation. In the Christian Scriptures they are called τὸ πρεσβυτεριοντοῦ λαοῦ—"the elders of the people;" and τὸ συνεδριον—"the council." The latter Greek phrase signifies being *seated together*; that is, as the Senate, or judicial council of the nation.

The throned elders in the vision represent the senatorial attributes or perfections of the Lord Jesus. Their white robes denote his mental, moral, and judicial purity and perfectness. Their golden chaplets are significant of his moral victories, and of his Divine and appreciable excellence; while the elders themselves are an embodiment of the idea of the perfect and unerring intelligence and wisdom manifest in his judicial ways and decisions. And the position of their thrones on an equality with the centre throne makes manifest that their several and combined characteristics are an essential part of "the revelation of Jesus Christ."

*d.* The "lightnings and thunderings and voices" which proceeded from the throne intimate that the supreme lordship and administration of Jesus Christ relate to a world in which sin and iniquity abound, and that his governmental powers shall at a future time be openly asserted and maintained, until all evil is suppressed, and is finally destroyed.

*e.* The "seven lamps of fire burning before the throne" involve an allusion to the seven-branched golden lampstand in the holy place of the tabernacle. They are designated "the seven spirits of God;" the significance of which is, that they represent the active and complete powers of the Spirit of God, as the Divine Agent of the throne.

*f.* The crystalline laver in front of the throne includes a direct allusion to the laver in the sacred court of the tabernacle, and which was filled with water from the smitten rock. The laver in the vision is designed to intimate the moral purity of JESUS the incarnate Son of God, the rightful King of Israel; and that he passed through death and resurrection to vindicate his right to reign.

*g.* The "four living ones"—the cherubim—within the circle of the throne, are identical in meaning and import* with the cherubim near the tree of life, with their artistic representation in the holy of holies, and with their presence in the visions which Ezekiel beheld. They symbolise the executive attributes of Jesus Christ—his majestic might, patient endurance and repressive power, perfect philanthropy, unerring intelligence, and capability of swift execution.

The cherubim in the holy of holies were an integral portion of the

* The "meaning and import" of the cherubim was familiarly known to the ancient Israelites, as is shown in one of the Psalms, where the writer poetically describes the interpositions of the LORD on behalf of those who trust in him: "He rode upon a cherub, and did fly; yea, he did fly on the wings of the wind." And in this saying the forces and laws of nature are recognised as executive instruments of the will and government of God. As it is said, also, in another Psalm, "Who maketh the winds his messengers, and the flame of fire his ministers."

Digitized by Google

mercy-seat; which in its entireness was symbolical of the governmental relations and powers of Jesus Christ, the sustainer and guardian of the glory of the Godhead; and of whom it is said that he was "fore-appointed a Mercy-seat—ἱλαστήριον—through the faith in his blood;" and the gold of the mercy-seat, with the cherubim, was the sacred symbol of Divine excellence and manifestive glory; therefore, we dare not think of the cherubim as representing created existences, however exalted.

Their adoring and repeated celebration of the holiness of him who sat on the throne is designed to signify that the administration of Jesus Christ is demonstrative of the holiness and equity of his governmental ways. And the prostrate worship by the elders, rendered to the immortal King, represents the truth that the Divine wisdom and power and glory of Jesus Christ are made manifest by his work of creation, and the purpose for which the universe was created, and still exists.

### The Second Part of the Vision.

"And I saw upon the right hand of him who sat on the throne, a scroll written within and behind, sealed with seven seals. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the scroll, and to loose the seals thereof? And no one in the heavens, nor upon the earth, was able to open the scroll, neither to look thereon. And I wept much because no one was found worthy to open the scroll, neither to look thereon.

"And one of the elders said to me, Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, hath prevailed to open the scroll and the seals thereof. And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne and the four living ones, and in the midst of the elders, stood a lamb, as having been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the scroll from the right hand of him who sat on the throne. And when he had taken the scroll, the four living ones and twenty-four elders fell down before the Lamb, having each of them harps and golden vials full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sang a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the scroll, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed (*men**) unto God

* The above clause, as written by the apostle John, was *elliptical*,—the word men being understood; the *ellipsis* being a characteristic of the style of that apostle. It is observable in his evangelical record, and in his first epistle; and in the record of this same vision (as a whole) it repeatedly occurs. The use of the ellipsis in the above indicated instance is unquestionable; for the cherubim and the elders are not redeemed persons; neither do they represent redeemed persons; but are personifications of the governmental perfections and powers of Jesus Christ.

The word ἡμᾶς—"us"—was evidently interpolated by some early transcriber, who erroneously supposed that the elders and the cherubim represented saints, from the earth, glorified in heaven. And that interpolation has been, and is, used to give countenance to the idolatrous practice of "praying to the saints," as unto mediators on behalf of their superstitious devotees.

The critical evidence of an early corruption of the text, in the particular under notice, is shown by the fact, that subsequently, and consequently, the pronouns which immediately follow were changed from the *third* person to the *first* that they might agree with the interpolated ἡμᾶς. The proof of this is supplied by the unanimous testimony of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles.

Digitized by Google

by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made them unto our God a royalty and priests: and they shall reign over the earth."

*a.* One of the elders announced "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David." A governmental symbol announced a governmental title, prerogative, and power; in which Divine and human royalties meet and are combined.

*b.* A lamb as having been slain is a symbol that bears a well-known relation to Jesus Christ; but it is NOT A SYMBOL OF HIMSELF. It is the symbol of his redemptive relation, his efficacious sacrifice of himself, and his subsequent and consequent immortality in manhood. And the sudden appearance of the Lamb in the midst of the throne, and the living ones, and the elders, completes the assemblage of symbolic appearances, and illustrates the truth that the whole represents, in combination, the various attributes and relations of Jesus Christ; for the maintenance of divine government, and for the intents of divine grace. And the action of the Lamb represents the title and competency of Jesus Christ to unfold and make known the counsels of the Godhead in relation to the government of the world, and respecting the destinies of nations, and of men.

*c.* The "harps and golden vials full of incense" possessed by the cherubim and the elders, and which signify "the prayers of the saints," represent the truth that the senatorial wisdom of the Lord Christ—the "Wonderful Counsellor"— and his administrative attributes and ways, are associated with, and inseparable from, his eternal priesthood; through which alone the praises, prayers, and spiritual worship of the believers are accepted of God the Father, and are answered in blessings received.

*d.* The prostrate worship which the elders and the cherubim rendered to the Lamb, and their celebration of his worthiness to unfold the counsels of the Godhead—these symbolic acts of adoration and praise denote and illustrate the truth that the senatorial wisdom and administrative ways of Jesus Christ are subservient to his redemptive office and history, and glorify him as the author of eternal redemption unto God.

### THE THIRD PART OF THE VISION.

"And I beheld, and I heard the voices of many angels around the throne, and the living ones, and the elders: and the number of them was myriads of myriads, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive (*the ascription of*) the power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which was in the heavens, and upon the earth, and beneath the earth, and such as are upon the sea, even all that are therein, I heard saying, To him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb (*be ascribed*) the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, and the power, unto the ages of the ages. And the four living ones said, Amen: and the twenty-four elders fell down and worshipped him who liveth unto the ages of the ages."

By this comprehensive representation we are reminded of the exaltation and glory of Jesus Christ, consequent on his voluntary humiliation and self-abnegation, and his obedience unto death, even the death of the cross, as it is written: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that in (*εν*) the name of JESUS every knee should bow, upon the heavens, and

Digitized by Google

upon the earth, and beneath the earth; and that every tongue should confess Jesus Christ Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

The scene and its characteristics are prophetic and anticipative. The view presented to faith is that of a universe from which all evil beings and evil things have disappeared, from which sin and death and all conceivable evils have been extirpated, and in which all that remains is perfected. Every province in the empire of God is a scene of rapturous exultation. Every being is jubilant in praise of Jesus Christ—the immortal Head over all—and of his redemptive work and moral triumph, whereby the end of evil had been effectuated, and the highest good eternally consummated. The mind of the intelligent and moral universe is one. All the blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, seen, and known, and felt, is ascribed to Jesus Christ, and the voluntary sacrifice of himself on the cross. And this universal and adoring ascription is justified and confirmed by the everlasting memorials of his unsearchable wisdom and righteous administration, and by the accomplishment of the eternal purpose and grace of God the Father, for the free gift of life and immortality, UNTO THE GLORY OF HIS NAME.

---

# CANON GARBETT ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

## II.

WE come now to consider Canon Garbett's arguments from Scripture against what we deem the very plainly Scriptural doctrine of Conditional Immortality, or in favour of what we hold to be the very unscriptural dogma of the immortality of the soul—meaning by that expression, as the Canon also means, that all human souls are immortal by nature whether they have life and immortality in Christ or not.

At p. 675 of the *Christian Observer* he writes: "It is our object to bring the Catholic doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the modern doctrine of conditional immortality to the test of Scripture." So also at p. 681, "The one question, therefore, with which we have to deal is the teaching of the Word of God." While he considers the more philosophical "argument adduced by Canon Liddon in his sermon in St. Paul's, on this subject" (we suppose "*Sermon on St. Paul*" to be a misprint) "to be very powerful;" his, Canon Garbett's, argument "is confined to the Scriptural aspect of the question, and to this alone." (P. 847.) We are well pleased to observe this, and are very thankful to remember it. Mr. Minton has dealt with, and demolished, Canon Liddon's philosophical argument for the immortality of the soul, in the pages of the RAINBOW. We are taking upon us the humbler and the easier, and yet, as we think, the more important task of dealing with Canon Garbett's argument on the same subject based, professedly, on Holy Scripture.

He begins, however, in what seems to us a rather suspicious manner, by telling us that "There are certain truths implied in Scripture rather

Digitized by Google

than asserted; they underlie the entire system of thought, and are so engrained into the very structure, the warp and woof of the language, that they are really present everywhere, and cannot be got rid of without disintegrating the whole. We believe this to be the case in the present instance, and that conditional immortality cannot be maintained without doing extreme violence to the language of Scripture and landing us in inextricable difficulties" (p. 768). This is, at any rate, an admission that the immortality of the soul is not anywhere asserted in Scripture, however it may be implied throughout. But what else we are to gather from this sentence as the Canon's meaning is not so very clear.

Does he mean, as many say, that it is so universally taken for granted that it needs not to be asserted; that it is an axiomatic truth held alike by all mankind, or at least by all of mankind that are possessed of any natural religion? Hardly that; for he puts it in this respect on the same ground as "the Deity of the Holy Ghost," the "procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son," "the observance of the first day of the week as the Lord's day," "the doctrine of infant baptism," and "the finality of grace at death." No one will say that these are everywhere taken for granted as axiomatic truths. What is said of them—and what we suppose Canon Garbett means of them and the immortality of the soul in common—is that, though not plainly "read in Scripture," they "may be proved thereby;" that there is reason from Scripture to believe that they were orally taught by apostles and prophets as part of the faith once delivered to the saints. We are quite willing to accept as valid and sufficient in this matter any real proof that may be adduced from Scripture that the immortality of the soul was taught by Christ or his apostles, or was received and held by them as already taught in the Old Testament Scriptures; even though such proof consists of passages where such teaching is only implied. But we look in vain for any such proof in Canon Garbett's papers or elsewhere.

In fact there are two very different questions suggested by the sentence quoted above, and, as we venture to think, somewhat confounded together by the writer. 1. Is the immortality of the soul assumed in Scripture as an axiomatic truth, not needing to be taught? 2. Is the immortality of the soul implied though not expressed in its teaching?

Both these questions have been answered in the affirmative. As it seems to us Canon Garbett does so, and as we decidedly answer them in the negative, we shall consider them both separately.

1. It is sometimes said that the immortality of the soul and the existence of God are alike assumed in Scripture. The freedom of the human will is also said by some to be assumed in the same way. It is supposed that these are so self-evident to every religious mind that there was no need to make a special revelation of them. And so we do not find that the Bible begins with asserting that God is, but rather, assuming that, with asserting that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Neither do we find it anywhere asserted that man's will is free, but rather, that being assumed, he is bid to refuse the evil and to choose the good, and is held responsible accordingly for his choice between good and evil.

So it is urged about the immortality of man, or, at any rate, of his soul,

Digitized by Google

that there is no assertion of this, but that it is assumed, and that men are addressed throughout the Bible as immortal beings, without being ever told that they are so, without its ever happening to be hinted that every human being is immortal and must live or exist to all eternity.

Now, this notion must proceed on the supposition that the immortality of the human soul is such a self-evident, such an axiomatic truth as to be universally believed by all men of common sense, and as to call for no revelation or proof of it. This is a question of fact. It may be so as to the existence of God. It may be so as to the freedom of the will. It is certainly not so as to the immortality of the soul. A large proportion of the human race does not believe in it. That man is a candidate for immortality—which the Scripture does teach as a truth of God—accounts sufficiently for many men of many nations having yearnings after it and thoughts about it. But it is well known to scholars like Canon Garbett that in their thoughts about it men have been greatly divided, some believing that the soul was imperishable, others that it perished for ever at death. No one will venture to say that, even if true, it is so plain to man's unaided reason as not to need some confirmation from revelation.

But as to the existence of God, though not asserted but assumed, it is certainly not tacitly assumed. It is everywhere spoken of throughout God's written revelation. God is mentioned directly and frequently in every book in the Bible except two; we might say in every page of every book except those two. Is it so with the immortality of the soul? Is it ever mentioned? The answer to these questions is well given, as follows, by Professor Hudson, in words which even Canon Garbett must assent to as simply true:—

"If we strike out from the record (of Holy Scripture) those passages that tell of his (God's) being and his works, we reduce the dimensions of the volume almost by half, we make it a book without sense or meaning, we exchange its radiant light for midnight darkness. But if we expunge from the same book all those passages in which man's immortality is expressly mentioned or unquestionably assumed, we leave the volume unchanged. It might have been written precisely as it is, and the revelation would have been just as complete as it is, if the sacred writers had agreed to ignore that doctrine, now so much on the lips of men; or, at least, to speak about it so obscurely that their words should settle nothing in the case."

And no one can say but that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is one that intimately concerned every human being to know about, if true. So much is this the case that we can hardly conceive of its being true, and man not being made aware of it very unmistakably. If, indeed, an immortality in bliss were in store for every man it might be kept as a gracious surprise to dawn upon the vast majority of men in an after life. But if the doctrine in question meant, as it must mean for a large proportion of those who have died in adult years, an eternity of torment, we cannot endure to think of that being kept as a very grim surprise for those who had never been made aware of it by any teachings of either natural or revealed religion. We are unable to conceive such a thing as possible with our righteous and merciful God. Thank God, we are not required by him to believe it for one moment. Canon Garbett's

Digitized by Google

immortality of the souls of his fellow men and his finality of grace at death, both, as in his opinion, implied though not asserted truths of revelation, neither of them known to half mankind, make up together a very ghastly composite dogma. We are happy to find it fall to pieces at the first touch of investigation; the former doctrine, at any rate, being, as regards Holy Scripture, neither asserted, assumed, nor true.

2. But is the immortality of the soul implied in the teaching of Scripture? This we also answer in the negative. We know of no passage of Scripture nor any unquestioned truth of religion which implies it. We know of neither Scripture nor truth that we cannot understand without, far better than with, its proffered aid.

Canon Garbett says, indeed, that it is one of those truths, that "underlie the entire system of thought, and are so engrained into the very structure, the warp and woof of the language (of Scripture), that they are really present everywhere, and cannot be got rid of without disintegrating the whole." But our answer to this is very simple. We deny the "real presence" of the immortality of the soul as a doctrine in Scripture. We demand some proof of its presence, however latent. We ask to be shown some occasional manifestation or intimation of its presence. And we assert that we have got rid of it from our theology without the slightest disintegration of the whole body of revealed truth. Indeed, we believe everything else that Canon Garbett believes—except eternal torment—all the more firmly and all the more intelligently for our getting rid of this terribly disturbing and utterly useless element of traditional theology. We find its room far better than its company. And what we say for ourselves we say for thousands of others. Will Canon Garbett tell us of one passage of Scripture that is obscured, or one truth of revelation that is clouded, by our denial of the immortality of Christless souls? We protest we do not know of one. Will Canon Garbett, or any one else, show us any possible use the doctrine of the immortality of the wicked has ever served, except to substantiate the otherwise baseless dogma of eternal torment, or to excuse and help out the denial—after the fashion set by Origen, and followed by Canon Farrar, and thousands of equally noble souls between—of the Scriptural doctrine of the eternal punishment, the everlasting destruction of the finally impenitent?

He says, too, that "Conditional immortality cannot be maintained without doing extreme violence to the language of Scripture, and landing us in inextricable difficulties." To this we answer in like manner that we protest we do not find ourselves in any inextricable difficulties. We could hardly be in them without knowing it. Nor do we know of any Scripture to the language of which we do extreme violence or any violence at all, owing to our maintaining conditional immortality. Will Canon Garbett give us some instances of what he asserts? There are a few passages of Scripture in which the word "immortality" occurs. Here surely, if anywhere, we would find the shoe pinching us, or we would be convicted of violence in attempting to make it fit. Does the holding of conditional immortality cause us to do violence to these? Strangely enough, Canon Garbett never once refers to any of these? Still we may ask (1) about Romans ii. 7, where St. Paul speaks of men seeking for glory, honour, and "immortality," by patient continuance in well doing. Does the language of this Scripture suffer extreme violence when



Digitized by Google

we maintain that the immortality (ἀφθαρσία) spoken of, is a boon to be sought for, and to be given on condition of its being sought for in the right way, not an inalienable possession already in hand? Or does it not suffer extreme violence when taken in any other sense than that of conditional immortality? Or (2) concerning 1 Cor. xv. 42-53, where immortality (ἀθανασία), incorruptibility (ἀφθαρσία), and incorruptible (ἄφθαρτος), are predicated, along with glory and honour, of the subjects of the first resurrection,—does the language of these Scriptures suffer extreme violence at our hands when we make all the immortality spoken of in them conditional on a living union with "the last Adam," "the second man, the Lord from heaven?" Or (3) do we offer violence to the language of 1 Tim. i. 10, when we declare our conviction that the "life and immortality" spoken of there as "brought to light by Jesus Christ by the Gospel," are both conditional on a saving interest in his redeeming work?

We hold, on the other hand, that Canon Garbett and those who think with him, do extreme violence to the language of these passages of Scripture if they maintain that the immortality spoken of is not conditional. Indeed, we are inclined to think that very few, if any, of those who believe in unconditional immortality doubt that these passages, at any rate,—the only passages where the word immortality occurs in Scripture in connection with man,—speak of conditional immortality. So that they must hold that the Bible teaches conditional immortality and unconditional immortality; only that the former is so expressly and plainly taught that few, if any, can mistake it, while the latter is so tacitly assumed as never to be once alluded to, and as to be denied altogether with a clear conscience by thousands of devout and intelligent students of Scripture.

Is it doing extreme violence to the language of Luke xx. 36, "Neither can they die any more," to maintain that these words of Christ predicate immortality of some people, and that the people of whom it is predicated are "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead," and who "are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection"—and that this means, without a doubt, conditional immortality? * We suppose that here, at any rate, our Lord meant by "dying," the cessation of some sort of existence, and not misery or unhappiness, and that he meant by "not dying any more," living for ever in whatever felicity may be attached to their eternal life.

* And yet we have before us a pamphlet entitled, "Who will live for ever? An examination of Luke xx. 36," by the Rev. John Howard Hinton, M.A., 1848, in which it is maintained in answer to that question, and on the ground of that text, that all mankind will live for ever! As this may seem incredible to some, we shall quote the following words of Mr. Hinton's (p. 21): "I revert then, with unimpaired confidence, to my conclusion, that the words of our Lord, 'Neither can they die any more,' constitute a direct and positive declaration of the immortality of the human race. To this I may add that as a Scriptural declaration of this important fact, this passage is of especial value, inasmuch as it is peculiarly distinct, comprehensive, and emphatic."

We understand that Mr. Hinton's pamphlet was extensively lauded by the religious press of the day as a most valuable and impregnable defence against the doctrine of eternal life in Christ or conditional immortality. We do not think that any respectable writer or any part of the religious press would now advance or defend the same opinion.

Digitized by Google

Would not Canon Garbett find himself in inextricable difficulty, and doing extreme violence to these words of our Lord, if he were to maintain that they are equally true of all mankind, i.e., that the immortality spoken of in them is unconditional?

Or is it doing extreme violence to the language of John vi. 47, 50—"Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead" (lit. "died"); "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die"—to suppose that "not dying," in ver. 50, is the exact contrary to "dying," in ver. 49, and that "not dying," or, as in the next verse, "living for ever," means immortality; and, further, that the immortality spoken of is conditional on eating the bread from heaven? If Canon Garbett maintains that all mankind will live for ever and not die, whether they eat of that bread or not, he maintains unconditional immortality indeed, but in so doing he surely offers extremest violence to very sacred language. If he maintains, as we suppose he does, that "dying," in ver. 49, means dying, the end of this mortal life, in the case of the manna eaters, but that "not dying," in the 50th verse, means not being miserable—he is certainly in the inextricable difficulty of making our Lord palter with the words he uses in a double sense, so as to mystify most mysteriously and unaccountably the poor Galileans of Capernaum.

We have thought it well to deal thus fully with that one sentence quoted above from p. 768 of the *Christian Observer*, with which Canon Garbett opens his argument against conditional immortality from "the teaching of the Word of God." It seemed a very pregnant sentence. It made a very serious charge against our position very boldly, and, at the same time, very vaguely, without any proofs being subsequently adduced to support it. At the same time it was eminently provocative of contradiction, disproof, and retort. We trust our readers will consider that we have sifted it sufficiently, and have dealt with it fairly as well as fully. We venture to think that conditional immortality is untouched by Canon Garbett, so far as we have seen as yet, and that it is unassailable by any such sweeping charges as we have been repelling.

W. T. Hobson.

(*To be continued.*)

---

## DR. PETAVEL.

In Switzerland, where the Calvinistic Malakoff has again and again been compelled to lower its flag at the summons of free-thought, intolerance has still its cardinals, and neo-platonism its lovers. Dr. Petavel, our distinguished friend and ally (he will pardon us for so terming him), whose praise should be in all the churches, and would be if the churches had but the wit to think for themselves, has still to fight a Sisyphean battle with the well-drilled captains of theology. It is true, he has repeatedly snapped their weapons in twain and cast them to the ground; but the weapons, though broken, are still good enough to harass a noble enemy withal, or, at least, to flourish in the sight of uninitiated



Digitized by Google

spectators. Meanwhile, the true investigators of nature's secrets, the philosophers by pre-eminence, are not Dr. Petavel's opponents; and it is with reference to them that he opens his third campaign in the *Revue Théologique* of last year,—the Essay, like its predecessors, bearing the title of *Conditional Immortality*. After a complimentary allusion to *L'Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, Dr. Petavel proceeds as follows:— [In some few parts our translation is abbreviated and summarised.]

"We may say, at starting, that Conditional Immortality has awakened hardly any hostility in the philosophical camp. M. Renouvier, the leader of French criticism, so far from denouncing our point of view, has given it his hearty accord, while the Editor of the *Critique Philosophique*, in his preliminary adjustment of the terms of debate, lays down,—First, that the eschatology of Messieurs Lambert and Petavel is in perfect harmony with the condition which bases immortality, not upon the indestructible nature of the living substance, but upon the moral right in the direction of progress, and upon the inevitable action of conscience as postulated by that right;—and secondly, that M. Petavel's treatment of the question, as one of exegesis, is abundantly justified if we keep in mind the place which the dogma of resurrection held both in Judaism and in primitive Christianity as the necessary condition of future life, a dogma which waxed weaker and weaker in proportion as the apostolic age receded from view, and the idea of natural immortality gathered force." *

"A modern doctrine which alarms many believers is that of ascending evolution; the triumphant progress of which might place the name of Darwin by the side of those of Galileo and Newton. We do not say that the system has yet enlisted the unanimous assent of the learned, but even though it should, conditional immortality will remain calmly undisturbed. Nay, ought we not rather to say that it will be recognised as the appropriate culmination of the system, and that the relation of science to revelation will be ratified accordingly? Such is the view also, as set forth by Professor Goldwin Smith, of Oxford, in *Macmillan's Magazine*, for January, 1877. The doctrine of evolution, he contends, does not banish from the action of a creating God the intervention of a formative influence in the various stages of his work. Darwinism, he adds, is consistent with itself in assigning to development a possible future as no less reasonable than a well-attested past. If man has passed successively, along with matter, from an inorganic to an organic state, from the condition of the animal to that of the savage, and eventually to that of civilised life, why should he not advance to the transfiguration and immortalisation of his being? The arrest of finality is at war with the instinct which refuses to regard nature as stationary. So, in theology, where the law of transformation is distinctly traceable, the best conditions survive; those which resist the law of progress perish. We would all like to be candidates of immortality; but he that sins voluntarily shuts himself out; the unregenerate will be the mastodons of the moral world; and God's election will be seen to be no other than

* How true this is may be seen in the declaration attributed to Origen by Hagenbach, in his History of Christian Doctrine, namely, that a belief in the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is not absolutely essential to the profession of Christianity, provided the immortality of the soul be maintained.—*Translator.*

Digitized by Google

a natural election where liberty has had ample play. These remarks, it is true, point to races rather than to individuals; yet, to many minds, they may furnish a physiological argument in favour of personal survival after death."

But leaving evolution to take care of itself, and abstaining for the present from Scripture authority, M. Petavel proceeds on the basis of what he calls "Universal Analogy," to ascertain the conditions of immortality, by first apprehending the conditions of man's existence. This is largely dwelt upon; and, though we grieve to compress the thoughts of so luminous a writer, our remaining extracts must necessarily be fragmentary.

"Seeing that the creation of man is a supreme good, his destruction cannot but be regarded as a superlative evil. Satan, as the type of evil, is, therefore, called by our Lord a man-slayer or murderer. Evil, voluntarily committed, takes the name of sin, and is fatal to the conditions of the moral creature with himself, with God, and with the world. To attempt to live in the violation of these fixed conditions is an insolent and foolish experiment. The law of progress being given, sin lies in the refusal to develop the higher elements of his nature, namely, reason and the religious sentiment. It is at this point that man commences suicide; he is falling back to animalism—a process not inaptly set forth by the mediæval artists, when they equipped Satan with cloven feet, a caudal extremity, and the horns of a goat. The penalty, moreover, is in exact agreement with the evil wrought; sin chastises itself and slays the sinner. This law, to which the ancients gave the name of Nemesis, has been thus expanded by that Father of orthodoxy, Athanasius, in his treatise on the Word made flesh."

"'Transgression,' says he, 'has caused man to fall backwards towards his natural state, replunging him by a gradual destruction into that condition of nonentity where creation first found him. Now, this is quite just; for his natural state was simply one of non-existence (φὺσιν ἔχόντες τὸ μὴ εἶναι), and he would never have been summoned into existence but for the presence and the goodwill of the Word. Is it not, therefore, right that immortality should be refused to that man who refuses to know God and marches towards nonentity? For, in truth, evil has no substantial existence; it is only good which positively exists, proceeding, as it does, from God. But the sinner having now become the prey of a dissolving power, and being mortal by his nature, remains dead and destroyed.' Athanasius then proceeds to exhibit what he regards as the great aim of the Incarnation, namely, to save man from relapsing into nonentity, and to render him immortal by renewing the divine image within him. Not less explicitly is the same view of the subject presented by Irenæus in the second century, by Nemesius in the fifth, and also by all the apostolic fathers, and by the greater part of the apologist fathers."

"Indeed, so conformable is this conception to the very nature of things, that it occasionally crops out even in the writings of those who dispute the position. In the recent florid work of M. Rougemont, for example, we have the following passage:—'That spirit which has resigned itself to the soft seductions of the flesh, vegetates in a mortal impotence which would issue in its death and annihilation, if it were

Digitized by Google

not indestructible.' (*Un mystère de la Passion*, p. 397.) Nay, but this non-proven indestructibility, does it not seem to start into view at the end of his sentence, as the *Deus ex machina*, just to snatch from the author his rights as a logician ?"

"Jealous for the conservation and restoration of his cherished creature, man, the paternal solicitude of the Creator has placed pain in the sombre passage leading to death. Pain is thus the vigilant sentinel warning him of danger; but the sinner, loth to accuse himself, curses that as evil which he ought rather to regard as the shepherd's staff reclaiming the wandering sheep.

"Pain always indicates the presence of evil. It is the commencement of death; and shows that destruction, either partial or total, is in course of accomplishment. But being in its essence symptomatic and preventive, it disappears, either when recovery is complete, or as soon as the malady becomes hopeless. Sismondi, in his journal, tells us of an officer of his acquaintance, Major Besançon, who, at the battle of Wagram, was struck down by a sabre-blow. For two hours, with a lacerated head, he rolled beneath the horses' feet; but, says he, the real sense of pain only commenced when he found himself in the tent and under the surgeon's hands. And Sismondi then adds—Providence has provided fainting as the relief of tragic agonies; and we hardly suffer acutely till we have the fortitude to suffer; that is to say, till recovery having set in, we make a struggle with ourselves to keep alive." (*Fragments de son Journal*, 78.)

"And thus we may regard the office which suffering fulfils in the teachings of Revelation. Noteworthy is the fact that prolonged sufferings are quite foreign to Old Testament legislation. No state-executioner ever appears. Neither question by torture, nor impalement, dungeons, racks, nor wheels, nor any other of the odious punishments which have disgraced ancient and modern civilisation, find their equivalent in the Sinaitic code. Crucifixion we know to have been of Roman origin; whereas, in the Jewish punishment of stoning, the very first blow was directed to shatter the criminal's chest. In sacrifices, where the victim represents the sinner, if the execution were prolonged, the sacrifice was rejected; and to this hour, if the smallest unnecessary pain result from the use of a defective weapon, the flesh is forbidden to the faithful. Even the burning of the victim was no symbol of suffering, for it came after immolation; it rather set forth the annihilation which threatened the incorrigible offender. The flood, the fire, the sword:—these have, in turn, overtaken the men of Noah's time, the inhabitants of Sodom, and the abandoned Canaanites. Their fate was terrible, but it lasted not. Nothing can be more prompt than the thunderbolt; and has not the thunderbolt, from time immemorial, symbolised the vengeance of heaven ? As Clement of Alexandria has said, 'Even chastisement reflects the Divine goodness; for its primary design is to save the sinner; and this failing, it issues in dissolution when salvation is no longer possible. The pity of the Great Parent, whose tender mercies are over all his works, is thus seen to occupy a domain from which traditional dogma and popular credulity have long time excluded it.'"

"But," contends Professor Bonifas, "chastisement implies suffering; and suffering is not only an incentive to amendment, it is also a reparation due

Digitized by Google

to God and to the majesty of law." For our part, we can discover neither a rational nor a biblical basis for this worship of pain. It is an idolatry and a superstition fetched from Buddhism and Fetishism through a Romanist channel. To torture a murderer is surely not the means of restoring his victim to life. We will meet the chastising rod with resignation. We will strive above all things to merit it no longer. But worship it we will not. Do you seek to discover a veritable sanction of a broken law? See it, then, amply guaranteed in the unvarying covenant which sin makes with death, either partial or total. It is not written, "The soul that sinneth shall suffer." It is written, "The soul that sinneth shall die," death with all its fearful accessories, if you will; but, after all, death is the sentence; and the eternal silences will render to violated law the homage worthy of its eternal majesty. The crime which set the law at defiance has expired with the criminal. Dead is the serpent, dead the venom. The law, adequately avenged, survives and triumphs.

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

---

# TEMPORAL DEATH NOT TOTAL EXTINCTION.

## SECOND PAPER.

"While he was yet speaking, there cometh one from the ruler of the synagogue's house, saying to him, Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Master. But Jesus, hearing, answered him, saying, Fear not: only believe, and she shall be made whole (Greek be saved*). And when he entered the house .... all were weeping and bewailing her; but he said: Weep not, she is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to scorn (!), knowing that she was dead."—LUKE viii. 49-53.

MR. MILL, in October, grows seemingly very impatient with tripartite man, holding strenuously to the mere material body, "men of the earth, earthy," as the genuine man. In protest against the "dividing of a man into parts and elements," he says, "Hear Paul: -'I think that God hath set forth us (not our bodies) [for, he might have added in explanation, our bodies are "*us*,"] last, as it were appointed to death.'" And then, in immediate juxtaposition, "bearing in their bodies the dying of the Lord Jesus;" where the apostle does use *body* discriminatively, not *myself*, or, (plural) *us*. Why, on Mr. Mill's theory, should the apostle employ the term "body" at all? Well may our brother declaim, "Forbear, forbear!" against any such paltering with Scripture language as he proposes. We are far from asking it. It was, indeed, "the body," however, as the visible material agent of the spiritually quickened soul, illumined and commissioned from on high, that "the apostle spoke of as an 'earthen vessel.'" Instead of "wholly destroying the beauty of the glorious passage" travestied, we would rather explain the apostle's meaning, as we understand him, thus: We have this treasure in (the) earthen vessels (of our frail material bodies) that the excellency of the

---

* Or, preserved. A very notable example of (even temporal) life preserved through death.

Digitized by Google

power may be (manifested as) of God and not of us (who are restricted to the use of such feeble agency as our bodies furnish). We cannot think that the apostle's "soul or spirit" was of earthen material, so forming part of the vessels conceived of as "earthen." Earthen bodies they had certainly, but as certainly not earthen souls nor earthen spirits. St. Paul describes the widow "given to pleasure" as "dead while she liveth:" thus apparently committing the very mistake Mr. Mill so vehemently and vexedly reprehends. See also Eph. ii. 1, "You were dead in your trespasses and sins:" yet evidently alive, or they could not have perpetrated them. The prophet Daniel says, "I was grieved in my spirit, in the midst of my body." (Chap. vii. 15.) And Paul speaks of being "holy, both in body and in spirit." How came it that the prophet and apostle should thus *divide* "a man into parts and elements," to the spoiling of a theory, such as Mr. Mill's?

The expression of the thought that would include the soul and spirit within the designation specifically of an earthen vessel, closes by telling *us* that Paul might "*himself* be 'absent'—'out of the world,' before the 'coming of the Lord,'" and that then "he would hear the voice of HIM who is the 'resurrection and the life,' and come forth:"—a condition, perception, and action, which it may be thought remarkable to find Mr. Mill himself predicating of an *extinct* man! The marring and obscuring of "the glorious beauty and harmony of divine teaching" is surely, therefore, rather to be ascribed to the endeavour to conform Scripture to his own bald theory, that "body-men" are the only nature of men of which we should take cognisance. And we hope that on perceiving this, his "sadness" will be turned to gladness.

We beg pardon of Mr. Mill if we have too roughly, or at all unfairly dealt with his "odd account of a figure." We know, however, that we were scrupulously careful to be fair, and are humbly prayerful that we still may be. Nor do we think that we are chargeable with roughness. We analysed as accurately as we could the thought as presented by himself, and we are yet compelled to deem it "odd" that a *figure* should be conceived as existing, when there is no more than *agreement* "*in one point*," whether it be of contact or of rest, with *disagreement* "*in all other respects*," between it and its correlate. A figure, by the very notion of it, cannot be summed up in a *point*. Neither does a point of *rest* constitute a "point of resemblance." As he narrows the resemblance between a fact and its figure to a mere point of rest, Mr. Mill's symbol of a figure had better been a cone on its apex than a ball; with this sure effect, that, as there is nothing save its basal *point*, that is of the slightest value, all else serving but to encumber it, it must of necessity, because of its unstable equilibrium, fall and crumble to atoms, completely *dis*figured.

It had been only just in my opponent, when alleging unfairness on our part, to have made demonstration of the unfairness. And we must hold, until the contrary be shown, that we not only "justly construed" his language, but that we put upon it its *only* fair construction. His hapless comparison cannot, we believe, be vindicated in itself; whilst it may help to account for and illustrate his confusion of thought about the matter in dispute. A ball (on a plane) he thinks a fitting parallel to the figure of *sleep;* because, while it touches the plain on which it rests at

Digitized by Google

one point, other parts of it may be very remote, indeed, from this point. And again, the plane, spreading away in all directions from the point where the ball meets it, makes it for him a suitable parallel to *death*. But we fail to discern the fitness of making the *figure* of sleep rest upon the *fact* of death at the *point* of unconsciousness, and then immediately thence inferring, as though an undeniable truth, that *physical death* is for man *entire extinction*. This implies that unconsciousness is a point lying lowest at the base of sleep, and also a point lying uppermost on the surface of death. But absolute unconsciousness has not yet been proved to be a *point* in sleep at all. And it is the end of my opponent's effort, not merely to prove that it exists as a *point* in death, but that it occupies the whole surface and depth of death, to the exclusion of absolutely *all* consciousness, so that he may not *assume* it there. Hence, the selection of *this* point of rest in the contact between the figure sleep and the fact death at least "*looks* arbitrary." And even though it were granted that there were a corresponding point of unconsciousness in sleep and in death, it would still remain unproven that unconsciousness extended, in death, *beyond* that point. And yet, again, though the whole of death were proved to be comprehended in the *point* of unconsciousness, that could not be a single step of genuine proof that "death is the entire extinction of life," for unconsciousness (witness a faint) is not vital extinction. Moreover, the death must be shown to embrace, together with the physical being, the psychical also, and the spiritual; or the comprehensive *point* of unconsciousness may be a point wholly without *their* borders.

Mr. Mill has really need, then, to deal more "cautiously with figures" than seems his wont. Just previously, for instance, to expressing his design of caution in this regard, he represents "light" as *dwarfing* "years" into a "moment," as though a figure employed by the apostle. But the figure is not his; for he contrasts, not a "moment," as Mr. Mill misquotes him, but "suffering," with the "glory" that is to be revealed. Neither do the *points* of the figure, as drawn by Mr. Mill, fitly harmonise.

For our part, we are challenged with an intimation that if not content to confine ourself to our opponent's "one point of likeness," we shall probably "outrage a figure," to "find even *one* point of resemblance between . . . . 'soul-life through death' and the figure" of 'a corn of wheat' dying," and as *consequent*, thereupon, bringing forth much fruit. This figure, as "employed by our Lord," is loosely quoted without the *dying*, and great emphasis is laid on the "much fruit" consisting in "*many* grains instead of *one*." Now we think we can show, not merely a single *point*, but a continuous *line*, if not even a full-orbed outline of resemblance, which our opponent's repeated endeavour cannot obliterate.

There is, first, the undeniable *point* of resemblance that, as the seed dies, so likewise dies the man. In each case this death puts a period to a stage of life, whilst in neither case does it absolutely extinguish life. Certainly it does not in the instance of the grain of corn. There the life is, *through death*, developed into grander proportions. There is assuredly no break in the continuity of life between the grain of wheat and the much fruit which *it*, *in dying*, brings forth. It is, according to our Lord, the "seed" that "a man casts upon the ground" that doth "spring and grow up," though "*he* knoweth not how." (Mark iv. 26, 27.) This, then, much more than satisfies the demand for the exhibition of

Digitized by Google

*one* point of resemblance between the figure adduced and our so-called "theory."

The distinctness of this striking parallel is shrouded to the mind of Mr. Mill by his again confounding his own theory with our faith. He says that the much fruit which the grain brings forth is other grain than the grain that brings it forth. The produce is "*many* grains instead of *one*, 'not ampler . . . . life' in the one that . . . . dies." That grain "is dead." And "no profusion of ambiguous terms can conceal the fact" that "its life has departed." Not the least have we sought, as insinuated, to "conceal the fact." But we maintain that when the *life* has departed from the human body, as from the grain, *it* is not extinct. The grain, yielding up, by dying, and transmitting its life to a nobler body, affords positive proof that *its* life is "preserved through (its body's) death," and so furnishes a most apt illustration of our "theory," that the *life* of man is preserved *through* his bodily death. That the relinquished life is ever "restored to the *grain that dies*," or, as anti-typical thereto, to the body of man that moulders into dust, is precisely what we have been contending against, holding the mere "body-man" theory to be a demonstrable error. And so Mr. Mill himself, with an inkling of the truth conveyed by this appropriate figure, has to qualify his denial of life *through* death, in the case of the grain, by an "unless it be held," concerning the very line of resemblance that by us *is held*. It is the *life* that is preserved, and not the original material *body* of the grain or of man; and it is the preservation through death of the personal identity of the *life* for which we are jealous, that the truth thereof may not be sacrificed. Thus, again, is it manifest that it is to confusion existing in his own mind that mars and obscures, for Mr. Mill, "the glorious beauty and harmony of divine teaching."

Mr. Mill is pleased to designate the dying as "the parent seed," suggesting the idea that it sacrifices its life in generating its offspring. This seems to be taking an unwarrantable liberty with the figure. Yet, even so, the figure would not serve his purpose. For, amid much of deepest mystery involved in the transmission of life from parent stock to progeny, this much is certain—that there is no intermediate *extinction* of *the life* transmitted, whether the parent die or not. Levi was "in the loins of his father," Abraham, "when Melchisedec met him." The organic life of Levi was already enfolded in the organic life of his ancestor ages before that later life came to its birth. Many deaths intervened, Abraham's included; yet there was certainly no breach in the continuity of that life ere Levi inherited it, either at Abraham's own death, or at any other epoch. Abraham did not die that his seed, numerous as the stars of heaven, might live. So that had the figure in question the relationship to fact that Mr. Mill assigns it, it still show no extinction of *life* in its transmission from parent to progeny.

Mr. Mill allows that "the figure, no doubt, as used by our Lord, has its proper application to HIM;" but he arbitrarily restricts it "to Him alone." In the figure, as we quoted fairly from St. John, there is not a syllable about the *one* grain before death developing into *many* grains after death. This aspect of the figure is pressed into service, imported from other Scriptures, where the lesson designed is quite apart from personal resurrection or bodily revivification;—the seed being the *Word*,

Digitized by Google

which, planted in the soil of an honest and good heart, bringeth forth fruit from thirty to an hundred fold. "The full corn," too, "in the *ear*," is the direct uninterrupted produce of the one grain sown; and the Scripture notes the increase of *quantity* rather than of number, saying not a word of the *many grains*.

Moreover, is not this identical figure used also by the Lord's apostle, Paul, with a "proper application to *all* believers? "Foolish one," says he, "that which thou sowest is not made to live except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that will be, but a bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to each kind of seed a body of its own. (1 Cor. xv. 36-38. Revised Eng. Bib.) Therefore, the figure may be applied to his people, as well as to our Lord personally. But restricting the application as insisted on by Mr. Mill, What then? Does the figure show "entire extinction of life" in death? I trow not; Mr. Mill himself expounding. He says, "Between the 'much fruit'—the many grains—brought forth by the death of the *one*, and the *many* believers receiving *life* through the one Christ that *died*, the likeness is perfect." Be it so. We ask, then, whether the *life* received by the *many* believers through the one dying Christ was absolutely extinguished at that death? The answer must be, No! For the "likeness" of the transmission of life between the one dying Christ and the one dying grain "is perfect." And "the one grain falls into the ground, gives life to others, itself dies, and lives no more." Here Mr. Mill, in an inaccurate statement, distinctly admits, nevertheless, the unbroken continuity of the life. The grain parts with its "life to others, itself dies." The truth is, however, that its death is the necessary condition of its revival in ampler life in another multifold and much more glorious body. For any farther than this conceded and undoubted "resemblance" we have no need; either as figuring the amplitude of the distributed life flowing to believers through the death of Christ, or as figuring the more abundant life through death of the individual sown. For, are not they, in truth, for whom Christ died, *one* in life with Him?—an "ampler" manifestation of his life than existed anterior to his death?

But "the self-same figure" presents to Mr. Mill's view a "contrast equally perfect" with the "perfect likeness." Indeed, he seems to have almost as keen a vision for contrast as for the coalescing points of figure and fact. The contrast appears to be this—That the one grain imparts its life to many, "and lives no more;" whilst the ONE Christ, having similarly imparted his life to many, is alive for evermore." That this contrast appears in the figure, for adducing which we have thanks awarded us, we cannot discern. For nothing is said or hinted in it of the *everlasting life*, either of the many grains or of the one Christ. And the contrast that is formed by the citing of *another* text rests upon the improved and disproved position that the grain's *life* has become extinct. Is it just, then, to attempt to wrest from us the figure, which so manifestly declares the possibility, nay, the *fact*, of life being preserved through death,—and to the truth of which even Mr. Mill, amid "ambiguous terms," unwittingly gives his verdict; whilst an inspired apostle uses the same figure for the same purpose that we have done, revealing life through death, with change of body, but identity of being,

Digitized by Google

—is it just to pervert this figure, so beautifully simple, and appealing to the observation and common sense of all, and to say that we have "unlawfully appropriated" it, when adducing it to teach its obvious and fairly undeniable lesson?

On Gal. vi. 8, we are asked, "Where is the likeness between the figure and the predicate?" As the passage does not embody a figure, but is a direct statement of fact, the question tends to promote confusion of thought. It contains, however, the terms, "soweth" and "reap," which have, doubtless, an allusive reference to "the seed and its fruit." The likeness between this figure and the alleged predicate we will proceed to demonstrate. It is this: That the "everlasting life" of the new-born child of God has its source and incipience at and from his new birth now in time, just as the life of "the full corn in the ear" has its commencement when the life of that corn is first quickened in the single grain, whose death and material corruption prepare the way for the forth-shooting of the "full-corn" life. Thus the *life* of the "full corn" exists already in the grain, *before its death*. Nor does this death for a moment destroy the life which passes through it from the grain to the full corn. To this exactly, then, do we liken the "everlasting life" of the believer in its relation to the life that is already begotten in him by the regenerating agency of the Holy Spirit of God. And we have more than once before explained that we must *wait* for the "everlasting life" in its unfolded fulness. So that Mr. Mill's discernment of this fresh "contrast," "as complete as can well be conceived," between our "theory" and the "apostle's figure," is but the produce, one of the many grains, of his own "fruitful fancy."

The "interval between seed-time and harvest," is not an interval in which the life of the seed *perishes*. Were not the link of life sustained, there would be no harvest to follow the seed-time for ever. So likewise with ourselves: if there is no spiritual life begun here, against which the gates of Hades shall not prevail; a life that shall pass through and survive death,—that by the power of the Son of God shall burst its bonds, and instead of being devoured by it, shall itself swallow up death in victory,—if there be no such transmitted life as this, there will certainly be *no* "everlasting life" beyond.

"He that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." (John iv. 36.) Our Lord is speaking of *fruit* gathered in *time*; for, "the fields . . . are white already for harvest," and "he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice *together*." And yet it is fruit for everlasting life; which fruit, we apprehend, being of the nature of *saved* souls, will not perish by intermediate extinction, ere they themselves have fruition of the "everlasting life."

The apostle James, too, in closing his epistle, associates the saving of "a *soul* from *death*" with the conversion of the "sinner" whom the soul personates. When the apostle says, "will save," does he mean, by and at that soul's conversion? or, does he mean, that the salvation will not take place until after resurrection? If, as seems palpably plain, the salvation from death takes effect immediately upon true conversion, then is Mr. Mill declared by this one passage, speaking straight to the point, to be in error in supposing that the *soul* of the converted suffers *death*, for it distinctly avers that it is *saved* from it. And surely it is not just to conclude that, after being saved, it will yet be plunged into it.

Digitized by Google

An explanation is demanded of a "contrast," whose statement, in our Lord's words, seems as plain as words can make it. It is said that "the question is not about 'living for ever;' but whether a man is preserved in life" in an intermediate interval? Any simple mind, however, will readily perceive that a solution of the former question in the affirmative, necessarily involves an affirmative solution of the latter; as, contrariwise, a negation of the latter would, of necessity, be a negation of the former. For, if there be an interval anywhere of failure of the life after its bestowment, it is not true concerning the life that it is "for ever." The living for ever includes the living "between death and resurrection."

Well may Mr. Mill desire to "simplify the question" by eliminating "the argument based on spiritual life having BEGUN NOW;" so fatal is that argument to his dogma of extinction. St. Paul urges us, through Timothy (1 Epistle vi. 12.), NOW to "lay hold on eternal life." How lay hold of it, if a void gulf of ages intervene between us and it? Again, he charges the rich to "lay up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on that which is really life." (Ibid. v. 19.) Is it conceivable that there should be an enormous space of vacuity between that which is "really life" and its foundation?" St. Peter counsels that we "should no longer live the rest of (our) time in the flesh to the lusts of men." (1 Epistle iv. 2.) Why this limiting expression of life to "time in the flesh," if there be contemplated no continuity of life beyond such time? The idea of this continuity seems certainly suggested by the phrase as an idea familiar and of course. And is there not the same implication of our life here in the physical body being but a portion of a larger tract of life, in such appellations of the believer as a *sojourner* on earth? (1 Pet. i. 17.) "Pass the time of your sojourning in fear." A time of sojourning is surely but a part-time of the life of him who sojourns. And, by the way, we have not found in Mr. Mill's papers any reply, as requested, to the simple inquiry on page 229, last paragraph, relative to the disposal of the new spiritual life of the regenerate at their physical death!

The thought of "everlasting life" being in any sense entered upon *now*, seems to present a grievous stumbling-block before Mr. Mill. We are truly sorry for this, as the conception is evidently thoroughly consonant with Scripture. Attention to a few passages of St. John's Gospel will make this plain. In chap. iii. 15, we read, "Whosoever believeth in Him may not perish, but may have everlasting life." Now the *having everlasting life* is so closely dependent, in these words of our Lord, on the *believing*, that no one, on hearing them, could think for a moment, we imagine, of postponing the "everlasting life" promised to a far distant future date beyond the believing. Whosoever believeth on the Son of Man lifted up may have this life. Surely the clear and straight inference is that as soon as he believes he instantly partakes the "life," notwithstanding its qualifying attribute, "everlasting."

The typical event to which this gift of life on faith is analogically compared, makes the instant entrance on the life a certainty. For it is, "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, *even so* must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever . . . ." The incident to which reference is thus directly made, is recorded in the Book of Numbers in these terms: "The Lord said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent,

Digitized by Google

and set it upon a pole, and it shall come to pass that every one that is bitten, *when* he looketh upon it, shall *live*. And Moses " did so, and " *when* (the bitten man) beheld the serpent of brass, he *lived*." (Chap. xxi. 8, 9.) No lost interval is there here between the looking and the living. But, as rendering the certainty still more sure, our Lord declares his gift to faith on faith, negatively as well as positively, saying that, " whosoever believeth in him (lifted up) may *not* perish." How impossible, then, to rely on our Lord's words, and believe, nevertheless, that such *will* perish ! The Lord says, *not ;* some of his disciples say they will, though only for a season.

Dr. Meyer's note on " everlasting life " in this place is worthy of attentive regard : " Eternal *Messianic life*, which, however, the believer already has (ἔχῃ) as an internal possession in ἀιῶν οὗτος (*this age*), viz., the present self-conscious development of the only true moral and blissful ζωή (*life*), which is independent of death, and whose consummation and full glory begin with the Second Advent." He then refers for comparison to chap. vi. 40, 54, 58 ; 1 John iii. 14 : " We know that we have passed out of death into life." Comp. again, v. 36 : " He has everlasting life, " i.e.," says Meyer, " the Messianic ζωή, which, in its temporal development, is already a *present* possession of the believer. At the Second Advent it will be completed and glorified ; and, therefore, the antithesis, *shall not see life*, referring to the future *age*, is justified, because it presupposes the *has not life*."

In the next chapter we read of " living water " that our blessed Lord " would have given " the woman of Samaria had she asked him. And of this water he himself testifies (ver. 4) " Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him will never thirst ; but the water that I shall give him will become in him a fountain of water springing up into everlasting life." This water, at Christ's gift, the woman might drink of at once, and thenceforward, as she rightly understood, she would ever have its refreshment, for it would well up within her, even " unto everlasting life." My opponent seems in bondage to a word, to which he attaches a hard and fast meaning. But it is the substantial truth that we should aim to lay hold of. A river may issue from a spring, whose waters, after gushing freely from their fountain source, may pursue their way for some considerable distance hidden from view beneath the surface of the soil. Then it may emerge anew, a noble stream, and thenceforward be called properly a *River*. Nevertheless, though not recognised as a river in its earlier course, its waters are all one continuous stream from the first moment of their up-springing at the well-head of the River. So " everlasting life," though lost to view from its uprising in the soul of man at his birth of the Spirit, is *one* without any severance of continuity from its first gift to faith, till its merging in the full glory of the " life to come," the " life " distinctively styled the " everlasting." We might pursue the subject further in demonstration of the truth ; but surely thus much suffices.

My opponent holds himself " entitled to ask, what is the difference, *in death*, between those who ' believed on Jesus,' and those who ' ate of the manna ? ' " We reply that the life of believers in Jesus is preserved through death by virtue of their union, and consequent oneness of life with him ; whilst the manna, as such, would keep no one alive through

Digitized by Google

death. It was physical food designed for the sustentation only of physical life; and physical death, against which there was no promise, of course, extinguished that life. So that the direct answer to which my interpellator is "entitled," is, That the believer in Jesus, according to his Lord's true and trusty promise, never dies; that is, never loses his life newly acquired and sustained by feeding on him, not even "*in* (*physical*) *death*. Whereas, they who "ate of the manna," and who had no such promise of "everlasting life" attached to their eating of it, became (physically) extinct in death. If, however, their faith reached to the "hidden manna," that, doubtless, avails for the preservation of *their* hidden life also through the power and realm of physical death. For, "he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever." (John vi. 58.) But, how little the children of Israel appreciated the manna as heavenly food, is typically apparent from their complaining cry: "Now our soul (life) is dried away; there is nothing at all besides this manna before our eyes." (Num. xi. 6.) "Our soul loatheth this light bread." They murmur again at a later period.

"'Tis no empty boast;
He who gave his host
Angels' food in days of yore,
Me will nourish evermore."

Putting "all theories aside," Mr. Mill still "complicates" the subject by suggesting absurd *contrasts* whose proper tendency seems to be to make confusion. He appears to ignore the figuratively symbolic relation of manna to the true bread that came down from heaven. Grander results may surely be expected from "eating *this* bread" than from the Israelites eating the material manna—a more durable effect from eating the true spiritual food from the heavenly Father, than from eating the temporally bestowed bread for the natural life. *This* was only designed to preserve the life of the body of flesh, and that for a time; *that*, the life of the spiritually renewed soul, and for ever. The likeness and contrast are surely clear to all who wish to discern them. Mr. Mill, to bring out his desired contrast, has to repair to another context in another Gospel. With the "most significant fact" of the four times repeated, "I will raise him up at the last day;" let it be noted, that it is, in the first instance, that which the Lord *hath not lost* (ver. 39); secondly, him that hath everlasting life (ver. 40); thirdly, the man drawn to him by the Father (ver. 44); and, fourthly, it is "he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, (and) *hath everlasting life*; and I will raise *him* up at the last day." Thus is it rather, "unequivocally demonstrated" that because, having been drawn into living fellowship with him, they are *not* lost, but, as twice stated in this connection, *have* everlasting life, therefore are they raised up. Mr. Mill affirms that "without resurrection," man "could not attain to everlasting life." Our Lord attests, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." To which authority are we to defer?

We lament the untrue portraiture of our belief sketched in the final sentences of the paragraph. We have not "averred" that "'believers' live on in 'conscious happiness' through death, *alike independent of body, and of resurrection.*" Whilst believing distinctly that at the resurrection at the last day there will be really something for our Lord to

Digitized by Google

raise, something to come forth at his summons, and *that* other than corrupted dust, we prize the hope of personal resurrection probably not one whit less than our opponent. But our hope is both scriptural, and reasonable, and substantial,—a hope of true resurrection, not a hope of pure re-creation after extinction.

Fully aware that the Scriptures clearly testify that God raised up his Son, Jesus; we yet think that that does not subvert the truth of our Lord's words: "I have power to *take* (my life) again:" which is sufficient to prove that he, at least, the Lord of men, was not extinct in death; for an extinct person can *take* nothing. Mr. Mill is profuse in his profession of allegiance to Scripture. Let him know that we too, we trust, "accept (its) statements in humble faith" unfeigned; though we accept not his one-sided, and sometimes blind, interpretation of them. Whilst declining to admit, moreover, that we have been *uncandid;* we will leave his intimation, that we "ascribe the honour and glory" of resurrection "to death," rather than to "the Lord of life," to the honourable judgment of our readers. He remarks that "Quite enough has been said regarding sleep;" and we can well understand his not wishing to hear more about it.

His last paragraph is so trivial that we do not think it deserves refutation. But we utterly repudiate his charge of evading his argument by substituting another phrase for his. We certainly are not bound always to quote his *ipsissima verba;* and I did not perceive that he was aiming at so trifling a sense. It is no part of our creed that *the soul* of man is man entire; and I should not think of ransacking Scripture to find a text to prove it so. What I affirmed was, that the "Scripture does often speak of the soul of man as, in a pre-eminent sense, *the man*, without any mention of the body:" which is true and instructive. And this is as much as we need or care to affirm. I sought to practise no evasion or craft. My contention is, against Mr. Mill, that the body is not pre-eminently, or of itself, *the man* in the full and proper sense of "man" after complete creation; and that the soul challenges a *superior* claim over the body *to be* he. My opponent's chief reliance is upon the feeble fact that, before man became a soul, he was designated "man." Let that go for what it is worth; which we think is very little, as we have shown. He insists that man is unipartite, his sole true substantial element, if we understand him aright, being his materiel dust-body. We, without denying that his physical body is a true part of him, insist that his soul and spirit are equally true parts, and that they most certainly are not extinguished when the body dies. Our Lord testifies that man, who can kill the body of his fellow man, *cannot* kill his soul. And Mr. Mill allows, from Scripture, that the spirit, when man's body dies, returns to God who gave it. It, then, also dies not with the body. What more explicit in the way of proof can be needed than just this?

"The Lord loveth judgment, and he forsaketh not his saints. They are preserved for ever; but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off." "The salvation of the righteous is of the Lord, their stronghold in the time of trouble." (Psa. xxxvii. 28, 39.) "Israel is saved by the Lord with an *everlasting salvation;* ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded, world without end." ("Unto the ages of eternity."—Marginal reading of Revised English Bible.—Isa. xlv. 17.) J. A. HAYWARD.

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

APRIL, 1878.

## THE CONTRAST OF THE AGES.

EVERY attentive reader of the Bible must have noticed that the characteristics of the present age are wholly different from those of the age to come. It would be a pleasure to write at length on this inviting subject, but it is not necessary. The mere mention of the fact will spur the reader's memory in search of many a passage where the "now" and "then" of mankind are set in vivid contrast by the inspired writers. And we may preface the few remarks that follow with an argument which should have weight with intelligent men. It is simply this:—If the writers of the Bible have described the present *æon* so exactly, dwelling upon its painful experiences with a graphic minuteness which every one feels to be correct, surely, the descriptions they give of the *æon* after the return of Christ deserve our grateful confidence. If they have spoken to our hearts and minds about the time that now is with perfect correctness, as every one must admit, let us gladly accept their glowing pictures of the time that is to be as evidence of our Father's determination that his children shall not always be in storm and darkness, but that calm and sunshine await them at the coming of their Lord.

For, be it remembered as essential to the validity of this argument, the writers under notice do not merely admit the fact of painful experiences; it requires no inspiration to do *that*; but they give the divine reason why men are subjected to these trials, a thing they could not have done, without the authority of God. It follows therefore, that their revelations of the future are absolutely true. The scenes they describe will be seen in all their exquisite beauty by eyes that will never become dull with headache or dim with age. The promises they make, under divine inspiration, will all be realised as facts in the actual experience of the sons of God, in the life incorruptible. And their predictions of the hallowed joys of



Digitized by Google

the royal family of heaven—the brethren and sisters of the Lord Jesus—will be fulfilled both as a necessity of the Father's faithfulness, and as a fruit of his love.

It is simply impossible that the present dispensation closes the dealings of God with the world. Our profound regard for his character, even if we had no clear revelation on the subject, makes the contrary supposition an offence to the intellect, and a burden to the heart. There *must* be an "age to come"—not in some fancy world of ghosts, concerning which the pulpit has talked nonsense for centuries, but—in this world, man's—Christ's—God's world, the material centre of the universe, upon and in relation to which the legislative and gracious acts of the supreme Ruler have all taken place. We must no longer be sent among "the infinities" to find a foot-hold, where foot-hold there is none, for the solution of theological perplexities; but must gladly accept the blessed fact that the future "habitable world" is here, beneath the sun that to-day passes over us in his circuit, and not "above the skies;" here, where our Lord was born, lived, taught, suffered, died; here, where his followers have borne their heavy burdens, and their brave testimony for his name's sake. The locality of the nobleman's kingdom is not in a far country, but in the land of his birth; and the righteous are to "inherit the earth," and to have "rest" when the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven. Tears and tribulation, sorrow and affliction are things with which God's chosen ones are familiar; but the time comes when this glorious vision shall become a fact:—

"And I saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of the throne, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, their God, and shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."

But there is an intermediate age between the present and that to which this apocalyptic scene belongs—an intermediate age, the beginning of which is probably very near; and it may help to shade our eyes from the brilliance of John's scenic paragraph if we look to that of Isaiah:—

"And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord; and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears. But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth. And he shall smite the earth with the rod of his

Digitized by Google

mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked; and righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox; and the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den: they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

The wondrous beauty of this passage has arrested the attention even of the most prosaic reader, and to those who can appreciate the lofty flight of inspired song it is a gem of rarest lustre. The prophet-bard was on eagle wing when he dared thus to speak of things which, so far as time is concerned, were many centuries in the distance, and which, so far as the facts are concerned, are contrary to all human experience. But we have to do here with the supernatural, and that is a sufficient answer to every argument drawn from the natural habits of the wolf, the leopard, the lion, and the asp. When God interferes, difficulties vanish; and every one must at least admit the splendour of the conception that when the disloyalty of man to God comes to an end, the disloyalty of beast and reptile to man shall also cease. But this is precisely what our poet sings. When the earth is full of the knowledge of the Lord, the shepherd need not fold his flock for fear of the wolf, and the mother need not apprehend danger to her child, though it put its little hand in an adder's nest. Beautiful prophecy! Happy times when it shall be fulfilled!

But stop! We must look straight in the face of a thought that visits us here. Have we not all made a mistake regarding the men who shall live in those happy, peaceful, prosperous millennial days? Our troubles in this age annoy us greatly; we are no sooner out of one grief than we are plunged headlong into another; and each succeeding affliction has peculiarities which make it look worse than all its predecessors. And so we think that the dwellers beneath the light of the New Jerusalem—the star of the King, of which the star seen by the orient sages was the type—must be highly privileged persons. And so indeed they will be—privileged almost beyond what our imaginations can realise; men with hardly any thing to trouble them enjoying a perpetual holiday under the blessed government of the ever blessed King. No war, pestilence, or famine; no destructive tempests, earthquakes, "tidal waves," furious elemental battles mingling earth and sky, and caring no more for human life than a whirlwind does for a straw. A fruitful earth, a smiling heaven, a healthy long-lived people—all the wretched features of our present fight with poverty, filth, disease, vice, crime, death, and the devil seeming to the men of those hal-



Digitized by Google

cyon years an incredible myth of the olden time, or at least, an exaggerated account of the mismanagement and misgovernment of their very stupid ancestors.

Yes, you say, would that our lot had been cast in the millennium, and not in this age of distressing conflict with every kind of evil! We die daily, and life is often a burden almost too heavy to bear. Our faith is so severely tested at times, that we are driven to the verge of despair, and tempted to think that we cannot be Christians at all, and that God does not really care for us.

Well, now, had our birth—yours and mine, brother—been postponed until the millennium, it would have been a very comfortable thing for us, certainly! But are you quite sure that your wish is a wise one? May there not be an unsuspected current of selfishness running through it, which blinds you to the privileges of the present age? Recollect, that God is making his heroes now; that the battle-field is the school in which he is training his mighty men of the future; that tribulation is the avenue to the kingdom; and that fidelity to the absent King, will get the prize when he returns. The grandest promises of reward and honour are to him that overcometh; but what will the men of the millennial world have to overcome? That they will be good and loyal and righteous we have no doubt; but we really do not see that they deserve very fervent thanks for these virtues when every thing goes smoothly with them, and when the devil, shut up in prison, will not have it in his power to tempt them. But loyalty amidst fierce opposition, godliness in the midst of the ungodly, and unwavering confidence in God, whilst the fell assaults of the malignant adversary are beating against the heart of the believer, are very different things. It is the men who come out of great tribulation whose white robes attract the attention of the universe. It is the victors who fought the battles of the Lord in his absence who are to shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

The contrast of the ages is a text for a volume. We merely suggest it for the meditation and consolation of the true followers of Christ. The old serpent is full of malice against them, because of their friendship with his destined Destroyer, and they must not be taken by surprise if he sometimes plunges them into deep grief. His time is coming, and so is theirs—his for everlasting destruction, theirs for eternal joy! ED.

Digitized by Google

## THE MINISTRY OF EVIL.

(*See* RAINBOW, *April* 1877, *page* 162.)

"THE ministry of evil"—oh! to sing
The fell foe chained to *His* triumphal car
Who rides in majesty, The Lord and King,
Victorious crowned, o'er all the earth afar!
Ah, happy seer! who thus, by faith, canst see
The secret working of the Hand Divine;
The mighty power, and wondrous alchemy,
Whereby the varied elements combine—
Together working—"still educing good!"
It *may* be that the heart most deeply taught
In mysteries of "the kingdom," through the flood
And furnace passing, "well refined," is wrought
To bear the master's image,—precious ore,—
As perfect good o'ercometh evil more.

Hastings. By MRS. JOSEPH FEARN,
Author of "Plain Rhymes on the Pentateuch," &c.

---

## APOCALYPTIC ESCHATOLOGY.

A GLANCE at the Book of Revelation seems to confirm, in a very striking manner, the hopeful teaching of the other Scriptures concerning the future of the human race.

The first three chapters of the Book relate, we are told, to the "things *which are*." The messages to the Seven Churches of Asia were intended for all who have "an ear to hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches;" and we must all feel that the admonitions, exhortations, and promises contained in them, are intended quite as much for us, as for those to whom they were first given. The Lord Jesus Christ is to the churches of the present day precisely what he was to the churches of Asia Minor, when John in vision saw him walking in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks. There is no change whatever in the relations of Christ to his Church since that time: the things which were then, A.D. 96, are still "the things *which are*."

But at the commencement of the fourth chapter we read that the apostle heard again the voice which he had heard at the first, and this voice said, "Come up hither, and I will show thee things which must be *hereafter*." A little consideration of what he saw, namely, that *at this time* the Lamb took *the book* out of the right hand of him that sat on the throne, *before the first seal was broken*, will show we think that the entire vision has reference to a *future age;* to what will take place after the close of the present dispensation. For observe,—

Digitized by Google

After a description of the throne and its surroundings, it is said that when the Lamb had taken the book, not only the living creatures, the elders, and the angels sang the praises of the Lamb, but "Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and *under the earth*, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." The UNIVERSALITY of this sublime ascription of praise to the Lamb is unquestionable; the phrase "*under the earth*" seems to shut out the possibility of the exclusion of any, and it is equally plain that it occurs "when he (the Lamb) *took the book*" (So Alford and Rotherham), and before the opening of the seals commenced.

We are led, therefore, to look at the vision as representing a *post-resurrection* scene, at the *commencement* of which the elders who sing in the new song, "Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood," are seen occupying their appointed thrones in heaven, as kings and priests; while every creature in heaven, in earth, and *under the earth*, beholds the Lamb that was slain prevail, when none other in heaven, in earth, or under the earth was found worthy.

Without attempting to enter minutely into what follows, some general lessons may easily be gathered.

A period of universal peace follows upon the breaking of the first seal, for not until the second is broken is peace taken from the earth, and they kill one another. It is impossible to say how long this time of peace may continue, for it is probable that, as in the Mosaic account of the creation, a long period of time is comprised in a single verse. But as seal after seal is broken, sin and its fruits are brought to view with increasing intensity, far surpassing anything conceivable under the state of things in which we now live.

The fair promise of the opening of the vision, when every creature sang the praises of the Lamb, and the fearful development of sin which follows, have been faintly shadowed forth in the past history of man. When the work of creation was finished, God pronounced it to be very good, but in course of time it had to be destroyed by the flood. After the children of Israel had been brought through the Red Sea, and again at Sinai when they had given promise of obedience, how soon did they rebel. And when their descendants entered Canaan, they served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that outlived Joshua; but soon afterwards did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim. The past history and present condition of Christendom, again, is by no means what might have been looked for from its promising commencement, when "all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house

Digitized by Google

to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart; praising God, and having favour with all the people." (Acts ii. 44-47.)

It seems that the future age will, to a certain extent, be a repetition, on a more extended scale, of that which has already taken place, and this striking analogy between the past, the present, and the future is what has led so many to conclude that some portions of the prophecy have already been fulfilled.

When we come to the breaking of the sixth seal, we appear to have reached a crisis. "For the great day of God's wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand." But before the winds are loosed to hurt the earth, the servants of God are sealed in their foreheads for protection. On the other hand, we read: "After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes and palms in their hands." Now, this great multitude, I apprehend, is not saved in the dispensation in which we are now living; yet they are to be safe with their Redeemer, and delivered from trial and suffering of every kind, *before the seventh seal is broken.*

Far back, in the Book of Genesis, we read of God's promise to Abraham, that in him and in his seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed. In the future, John, in this vision, sees a great multitude of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues, who, with robes washed in the blood of the Lamb, stand accepted before the throne of God. Now this reads marvellously like the fulfilment of the promise given to Abraham, a promise that I have on a former occasion shown to have reference to a future age; and it becomes difficult to avoid the conclusion, that *after the first resurrection has taken place,* when God's elect are seated on their thrones, to reign as kings and priests, and all power has been given to the Lamb, as alone found worthy to receive it, that the everlasting Gospel will be preached to all nations, with the result here given,—an innumerable multitude gathered into the Saviour's fold, and the impenitent left on the earth to be further dealt with in righteous judgment.

After the servants of God have been sealed, the great multitude gathered from the earth, and the seventh seal broken, preparations are made for the sounding of the trumpets, when the earth is visited with judgments of a terribly severe character, increasing in intensity as the last three sound. "Woe, woe, woe to the inhabiters of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpets of the three angels which are yet to sound."

The explicit manner in which it is stated that the last three trumpets are sounded in their consecutive order (see Rev. viii. 13; ix. 12; x. 7; xi. 14) affords strong presumptive proof that the events occurring at the breaking of the seals, have place in the exact order in which they are written. Men may now think lightly of

Digitized by Google

sin and its consequences, but it is impossible to read the account of what is to take place on the earth at the breaking of the seventh seal, without a feeling of dread and amazement at the fearful virulence of sin and its ultimate consequences; the state of mind at which men may arrive we can, indeed, but faintly realise now.

The question here suggests itself, "Is it possible for us who are now living, to escape these judgments of the coming age, except by repentance and faith in Christ?" The closing words of the Book show that these things deeply concern us personally; we may bring upon ourselves these plagues, and lose our part out of the book of life, the holy city, and the things written in this Book (xxi. 18, 19). It is important that we should search for *scriptural views* of future judgment and punishment, for in the recoil that has taken place from what is known as the orthodox view, we are in some danger of being led away from the truth in an opposite direction.

This Book of Revelation seems to show most clearly that whilst the punishment of sin will be a terrible reality, God will in all his dealings in judgment seek the sinner's good, and will only as a last resource cast the incorrigibly wicked into the lake of fire, which is the second death. Even when the last trumpet has sounded, before the filling up of God's wrath is poured out upon the earth, an angel is sent to preach the everlasting Gospel, and to beseech men to fear God and give glory to him; whilst another angel warns them of the fearful consequences of worshipping the beast and his image. And it appears that some give heed to this angelic message and are saved, for the Apostle "saw as it were a sea of glass, mingled with fire; and those that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on this sea of glass, having the harps of God" (xv. 2). Whatever difficulties there may be in interpreting many things in this Book, there can be no doubt at least that it exhibits God's mercy and long-suffering; and that He is "not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." But, on the other hand, it is equally clear that when the last vial of his wrath has been poured out, there will still be some who will only blaspheme him "because of the plague of the hail."

Before the final judgment takes place, we come to what is usually called "the millennium,"—the thousand years during which Satan is to be bound, and when "them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the Word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, live and reign with Christ. In all ages, God has held out the prospect of special reward to those who show themselves worthy of it. Our Lord himself said: "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that age, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." (Luke xx. 35, 36.) Again, we read of the hundred and forty-four thousand

Digitized by Google

who remain on the earth when Satan exercises his fearful power: being able to sing that new song which none besides could learn. It is also evident that those faithful ones, who will refuse to worship the beast and his image, and who will suffer martyrdom in consequence, will have their special reward: they will be raised from the dead whilst others sleep, possess bodies over which death has no power, and for a thousand years will occupy exalted positions with their Saviour as kings and priests.

The conditions under which these saints obtain this special reward ought, however, to show that God has already provided a better thing for *us*; for if we are *now* faithful followers of his Son, we shall be joint heirs with him, and partakers of his glory *at his coming*. However deep, therefore, the interest, and however great the share we may take in the work he will then carry on, it will not be our lot to be beheaded and die for the witness of Jesus. The incorruptible crown which is offered to us, is to be obtained by faithfully following the Lord Jesus *now*; and it will be given when the chief Shepherd shall appear; and as the four-and-twenty elders are redeemed to God by the blood of the Lamb, out of every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation, it seems right that believers should hope and earnestly strive to be accounted worthy of a place amongst them; but we have no right to expect a place amongst those saints mentioned in Rev. xx. 4, unless we expect previously to pass through their tribulation and martyrdom.

At the end of the thousand years Satan must be loosed for a little season, apparently to test the nations which are in the four corners of the earth, preparatory to the final judgment, when the issue in every case will be one of *life* or *death*. "Whosoever was not found written in the book of *life*, was cast into the lake of fire, which is the second *death*."

The last chapters disclose the eternal state when the first heavens and first earth have passed away, and there is no more sea. "And I, John, saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new."

It is manifest from this that the whole fruits of Christ's redemptive work were not gathered in when the great multitude which no man could number were seen before the throne of God; for there is a further ingathering at the time of the judgment before the great white throne; when the sea, death, and hades deliver up the dead to be judged every man according to his works.

Digitized by Google

Indeed, the time and circumstances of the two ingatherings differ so widely, that we are compelled to regard them as altogether distinct. The great multitude are seen before the throne of God, serving him day and night in his temple, *before* the seventh seal is broken; but the last ingathering takes place as the result of the final judgment when the last enemy is destroyed and all things are made new. The one occurs long before the millennium commences, the other at its close; so that the two events are separated, at the lowest possible computation, by over a thousand years.

When we come to the Apocalyptic vision of the eternal state, we not only see that there are the servants of God, who serve him in his immediate presence, but there are also the nations outside who walk in the light of the Holy City, and for whose healing the leaves of the tree of life are provided.

We appear to have, then, in the Book of Revelation, an unfolding of the manner in which God will, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, gather together in one all things in Christ. From the various aspects of the kingdom of heaven presented in the parables of our Lord: The tares amongst the wheat which must be tied in bundles and burned at the end of the age: the bad fish which have to be thrown away: we are taught to expect that the kingdom in its progress will comprise periods of conflict with evil, and that enemies will arise who have to be conquered. "For he must reign *till* he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor. xv. 25–28.) In the closing chapters of the Book of Revelation these words seem to have their complete fulfilment. *A. H.

---

## "THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT" AND "THE UNITY OF THE FAITH."

Eph. iv. 1-16.

EVERY true Christian must confess that the failure of the members of the Body of Christ, children of God, to bear effective witness in the world to the unity of a holy family in the love of God, is a matter of deep humiliation. But how much deeper should not that humiliation be, when the internal causes of the absence of unity are pressed on the conscience. Grievous, unutterably grievous is it to survey the ways and acts of even vital Christians in the midst of a world that increases its scoffing hostility to the religion of Jesus Christ, owing to the absence of combined practical testimony to the calling, hope, inheritance, and source

Digitized by Google

of life in the Son of God, of those who have been characteristically denominated "the salt of the earth," and "light of the world!" Surely the heart of him who bestowed that character sorrowfully foresaw that "the salt" would "lose its savour;" that, though light might exist, it would not be *held forth* as proof of a life in the Son of God, and would therefore deserve that its lamp-stand should be "removed out of its place!" 'Tis sorrowful enough to witness the stirring up of the evil passions of the worldly nations and the potsherds of earth, to listen to the cruel atrocities and groans of an oppressed creation, the work of the devil, who was a murderer from the beginning; without having to endure the biting, devouring, unwarrantable judging, anathematising, and excommunicating proceedings of the living members of a family *of God*, professedly possessing the Divine nature—love—and that on the plea of doing God service! Can there be any solemnity of thought concerning "the judgment seat of Christ?" who, though "a merciful," is also "a *faithful* High Priest in things pertaining to God," who will righteously judge both things of omission and commission, and may very likely have to pronounce those words of solemn import—"I have somewhat against thee!"

II. It is impossible to deny the absence of a unity of the testimony for the manifestation of which children of God, as servants of his Son our Lord, have been maintained on earth and constituted "an habitation of God through the Spirit;" but let us endeavour to ascertain the causes of such shortcoming. That there are diversities of creeds, opinions, views, or expressions regarding certain doctrines in the Word of God, is too obvious a truth to raise a question, and I think their origin may be approximately traced to one or other of the following incidents:—Inattention to the word as *one entire revelation* inspired by one Spirit in two volumes; non-observance of dispensational truth, i.e., the distinctive ways and testimonies of God in the several varying ages of the world, particularly that which immediately preceded, and that which has followed the advent of Christ; the peculiar and fanciful allegorising of Scripture; the practice of accommodating it by an unwarrantable application of isolated texts; confounding revealed facts with human inferences: and tenacity of retention of uninvestigated tradition. Furthermore, these causes—and there are doubtless more—have led to the conflicting appeals of the several bodies of the Church to the one Book as authority for their unassociated action.

III. It is furthermore undeniable, that while—owing to the existence and insidious nature of the flesh—many differences and disagreements must be looked for, much of the bitterness and unchristian-like action would have been avoided if there had been an intelligent recognition of *a fact* that has been Divinely declared, it may be with the very object of engrafting the bond of family peace. The fact to which I allude is that a "UNITY OF THE

Digitized by Google

FAITH"* is *not* contemplated *till* the Body of Christ is numerically complete, and attains its mystical perfection of spiritual knowledge and wisdom at its resurrection union with the Divine Head. (Ephes. iv. 13.) "The unity of the faith" is here affixed to "the knowledge of the Son of God," who is therefore the object both of the faith and the knowledge here spoken of. Πίστις and ἐπίγνωσις, not merely cognition but recognition, express or comprehend all the elements of that condition of soul that culminates in eternal life. "None knoweth the Son but the Father;" the Son! God manifested in the flesh, who loved us and gave himself for us even unto death, who, having purged our sins, is now enthroned High Priest after the order of Melchizedec, the brightness of the glory of God and express image of his person: to know him declares a condition of soul that apprehends his coming glory, that conceives the further manifestation of God in the sublime majesty of the government of his kingdom on earth, together with his high office of Judge both of the living and the dead! Such is the object presented; but are these Divine attestations to the Son, in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead in glorified humanity, generally recognised and accepted in their wondrous peculiarities? or are they likely to be? To this I may reply that the complete subjugation of the obstructive flesh is not contemplated as possible on earth, it ceaselessly lusteth against the Spirit to the end that the things we would do we do not (Gal. v. 17), even though that Spirit has come to guide into all the truth. "If we (believers) say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves;" if it were otherwise, the high advocacy of Jesus Christ the Righteous One on behalf of ceaseless shortcomings and transgressions would not have been spoken of. (1 John i. 8; ii. 1.)

IV. But whilst all this is the case, another *fact* is presented side by side with the former, viz., that there *is* a capacity in all members of the body to serve the Lord Christ as instruments in the hand of the Spirit by the "endeavour to keep THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT in the bond of peace." (Eph. iv. 3.) "The UNITY OF THE FAITH" is not now possible, but "THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT" is, moved as Christians should be by the ministry of the Spirit appointed by the Divine Head from heaven, to full appreciation of the marvels, blessings, and glories of the grace of God. This character of truth is laid down in vers. 1-6 of our chapter, not only for the obedience of the faith, *but for a powerful testimony*, to which I would now draw attention.

V. The Epistle to the Ephesians is essentially a Divine revelation concerning the Church as the witnessing Body of Christ, having particular reference to his glory, who, as Head of that body, holds all things in one under his feet. This body, having been chosen in

* *In* the unity of the faith" should be "*unto* the unity;" the words are εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα.

Digitized by Google

Christ before time was, is made acquainted *in* time with its predestination to the most intimate relationship with God as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and is consequently declared to faith to be holy and blameless in the Divine presence in heaven. From this foredetermination of God flowed the redemption of the members "by grace through faith" in the vicarious sacrifice of the Son of God, the Divine record of their eternal union with him in his resurrection life, the imputation of his moral excellence, and the hope of their participation in his glory and throne. (Rom. iv. 22-25; viii. 29; John xvii. 22; Rev. iii. 21.) It is the Divine unfolding of such an otherwise incomprehensible mystery of immeasurable love, and of the manifold wisdom of God, that points to the moral privilege as well as obligation for a consistent conformity of walk, ways, and witness of this body to so amazing, so marvellous a vocation; and yet! . . . But I wish to refer first to the Divinely inferred impossibility of a "unity of the faith" in the heavenly doctrines concerning the Son of God during this age of impotence and antagonism of the flesh, in order to show how the display of "the unity of the Spirit" should be an object earnestly striven for under such admitted circumstances.

VI. Eph. iv. 12, 13. The ministry especially appointed by the Head of the body for its formation, organisation, and instruction, will, under the energy of the Spirit, complete the peculiar as well as the aggregate numerical perfection of its members at the hour when it is the purpose of God to gather them all in one to the trysting place with Christ the Lord in the air. (1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.) During this operation, however, the work of the ministry thus constituted, is for the purpose of forwarding the increase of the body, and *for* "*the edifying* OF ITSELF IN LOVE!" Evidently, therefore, a work imperatively calling for *harmonious* co-operation with special reference to the revealed standing of the body in heaven in Christ, its regal privileges, and its *contemplated* ultimate knowledge of the Son of God, when as glorified members there shall be a realised union with their glorified Head. By means of this ministry the body should be gradually rooted and grounded in Christ as the embodiment of the perfect love of God, and of the eternal excellency of man redeemed in him, the vessel of all grace according to the conception of God in Christ. Here I repeat, that whereas there is no distinction of persons with God, *all* being saved by grace, and as each and all are children and heirs of God through one common principle of faith, *mutual* recognition of the hope, the coming joy of family union in a Father's house, is surely that which should characterise both the life and the testimony of such pre-eminently blessed individuals. Alas! has the world been made acquainted with the truth in this form? Much is done, doubtless, by the "evangelists" outside the body, by the preaching of the Gospel of the grace of God and the vicarious sufferings of Christ; but comparatively less of a Gospel of "the glory that shall follow," that hope of glory by a resurrection unto eternal life in Christ; or of

Digitized by Google

the looked for manifestation in the glory of the kingdom "when he who is our life shall appear!" The work of the "pastors and teachers" within the body has failed to produce that recognisable kind of "truth in love," and that "edifying of itself in love" contemplated in the 15th and 16th verses of our chapter.

VII. Is it not true that the work of Spirit-guided ministry, fruit-bearing and witnessing lives and conversation of the members of Christ can be *effectually* discernible *only* by their action as "Members one of another;" that the body which is *one*, though having many components, positively demands the united and affectionate concurrence of *every* limb, the "effectual working," in *mutual* dependence, of "every joint?" Let *the fact*, therefore, that I have noted above of the hopelessness of "THE UNITY OF THE FAITH," be humbly accepted, and let there be, in the meantime, obedience to the command for a practical "endeavour to keep THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT in the bond of peace." This, at any rate, in connection with the work of the ministry, is not only possible, but morally incumbent, and will be a light shining in a dark place before men with a view to the glory of God as a Father. Alas! I am penning this exhortation at the end of the nineteenth century, when "the night is far spent." Night, indeed, in the spiritual firmament of which the stars have been obscured by the clouds and mists of many varied creeds, false doctrines of seductive spirits, and the treacherous idolatry of the world. These have "beguiled" the body from "the simplicity that is in Christ," and the chastity of her betrothal to him who is her Bridegroom and Lord! But though "THE DAY is at hand," there may yet be time to "cast off the works of darkness and put on the armour of light," to stand, and live, and testify against prevalent and increasing evil, as those who have to give an account and are hourly expecting the Lord from heaven, Morning Star, bright harbinger of THE DAY!

VIII. Now for the testimony to "THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT IN THE BOND OF PEACE." It is important to observe that this "unity of the Spirit" is not similarity of sentiment or opinion; but the oneness of members of the body of Christ, established by the Holy Spirit, and maintained on earth for the purpose of manifesting the love and grace of God in a practical visibility of harmony, congeniality, co-operative, and mutually dependent alliance. The exhortation to "keep the unity" is founded on certain revealed truths, which, however lamentable the failure of the body, are *unalterably determined* in heaven, and can never be impaired by any disturbance or any discordant segregation on earth.

"THERE IS ONE BODY AND ONE SPIRIT." This body is one inasmuch as it is alone signalised from all other objects that are owned of Christ as the Lord; in him is its life, in him is its inheritance; to him is the body betrothed as a bride to her bridegroom; in him she *is* blessed with all spiritual blessings in heaven, her wondrous calling is into fellowship with him, as the Son of

Digitized by Google

God; he is Lord both of her destiny and her affections. All this is effected in the body by the working of the Spirit producing a hope of the realisation of her vocation, a hope that is an anchor of the soul cast within the vail, a hope that cannot cause disappointment, for our Forerunner Jesus in glorified humanity has entered there FOR US. This, at least, was the purpose of God in sending the Spirit as the Divine Comforter of the body during a sorrowful period of witness-bearing.

IX. "One Lord!" The testimony to the Lord is that he is ever One from the moment when creation disclosed him: through eternity, as from eternity, he is the same. (Heb. xiii. 8; Deut. vi. 4.) Yet this Oneness of Being that pervades both the Old and New Testaments is a mysterious truth known only to those who have received the Spirit. To advance the evidence that "the Lord God" and "Jehovah" of the older oracles is the second person of the Divine Trinity, manifested as Jesus Christ in the later Scriptures is not the object here, though that evidence abounds. God, who has been perceptibly declared in divers ways in former ages, has been now made manifest in humanity for the work of redemption, so that confession of "one Lord Jesus Christ" is salvation, for it is belief in that one Name that separates the living body from a world dead in sins. The time, moreover, is coming when he who is now worshipped only in the body of his election, will be one Lord, almost universally acknowledged as such among men. "In that DAY," the day of his visible sovereignty over the millennial earth, "There shall be one Lord, and his name one." (Zech. xiv. 9.) But in connection with one Lord is "one faith and one baptism." The supreme Object of this faith is "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," though its nearer confidence is the name of "one Lord, by whom we have access to the Father." Faith is the one means of present communion and of hope of future glory; it is the distinguishing mark of every member of the body, a special gift of God to be exercised "according as God hath dealt to every man the "measure thereof." (Rom. xii. 3.) One baptism here is that of the Spirit according to 1 Cor. xii. 13, where, after describing the symmetry of the body and the various operations of the Spirit to produce concurrent action of the members, it is said, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body . . . and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." This is as necessary a truth for attestation as that there is one body.

X. Finally, there is the paramount truth of all sound doctrine, placed last as interlinked with all the former, compacting the several parts into one indivisible and sublime unity: "One God and Father of all, who is above all, through all, and in you all!" There are two statements asserted here; (1.) a revelation of Divine supremacy over, as well as the source of, all creation. (2.) That God is *in* all his believing people, a wondrous marvel declared since the Holy Spirit came from heaven as the triumphant witness to the perfec-

Digitized by Google

tion of that work of redemption, by virtue of which saved sinners are recognised as "an habitation of God" in holiness. Whosoever confesseth that "Jesus," once the vicarious representative of "sinful flesh," who "hnmbled himself even unto the death of the cross" for sin, "is the Son of God;" who shall believe in the revealed fact that this propitiation for the children's sins is the manifestation of the love of God, possesses the irrefutable proof that "God dwelleth in him, and he in God." (1 John iv. 9, 15, 16.) Compare now 1 John iv. 12 with his Gospel, chap. i. 18, for a clearer appreciation of the foregoing truth. "No one hath seen God at any time." How is this to be understood? In John i. 18 we further know that "the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared him." He, who in the most perfect intimacy, in the most absolute nearness, and as the one eternal, absorbing object that knew the love of the Father as his only Son, has revealed him to us children as he has himself known him. This God who has *thus* been declared, dwells in us, we can inwardly enjoy him and have fellowship with the Father and with the Son; His love is perfected in us as that love has been manifested in JESUS his only begotten Son! How expansive is the grace of the Gospel!

Philosophers are now, in the arrogance of worldly wisdom, displaying their ignorance of God by a denial of the first element of the above truth, viz. that "God is above all and through all," the unquestionable prerogative of the Creator who "*made the world and all things therein*, who is Lord of heaven *and earth . . . who giveth to all life and breath and all things!*" The greater need therefore for that character of testimony that shall hold forth the light of Divine truth against such lovers of darkness.

XI. Now, let Christians indeed and in truth just survey these elements that are said to constitute the "UNITY OF THE SPIRIT;" and as they value "THE BOND OF PEACE," that Divine link that binds all members of the one body to Christ the Head, "who *is* our Peace;" the measure and surety of our common reconciliation to one Father; let each and all *consider* profoundly how, by grace through faith, the "endeavour to keep" *and to bear witness to* this "unity" is not only possible, but incumbent, if we would avert a sentence of disapproval in the hour of scrutiny of the great High Priest who will judge according to the light that has been displayed by the "seven golden lampstands;" remembering that even with the most earnest "endeavour" there must remain the humbling acknowledgment of unprofitable service; yet *how much more so* without that "endeavour!"

H. GOODWYN.

---

Digitized by Google

# "THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY COME TO PASS."

No. IV.

REVELATION i. 1.

*(Continued from March.)*

BUT not more important is *readiness* for the rapture of "those who are alive and remain," than for the departure hence of those who sleep in death, when viewed in the light of the *first* resurrection. If, "in the place where the tree falleth there it shall lie" in resurrection, and "the dead know not anything," for, "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither we go," so that change in our state Godward there can be none between death and resurrection, *then* is it all important to live in readiness, that we may die in readiness, and so share a glorious part in the *first* resurrection. If this be not so, we fail to understand the earnestness expressed by the apostle (Phil. iii. 8, 11): "I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him; that I may know him, and the power of *his resurrection*, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death, *if by any means* I might attain unto the resurrection *from among* the dead." (See Emphatic Diaglott.) Why, if the apostle entertained the thought of growth and development between death and resurrection, was he concerned to finish his course with joy? But life ending here was to him a finished course, and hence his exultant song in departing, "I am not ashamed, for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day. For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth, there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." (2 Tim i. 12; iv. 6, 7, 8.)

From all which we see the faith of the apostle transferring his hope from the present moment of suffering and death, to that day when in resurrection he, together with all who love the appearing, should receive the overcomer's crown.

Whereupon we conclude that not more surely will the changed ones be an election from among the righteous living, than that the *first* resurrection will be an election from among the righteous dead. Hence we read, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection," which, to our understanding, reads, "He that hath part in the first resurrection is especially blessed and holy." True it is, that every believer is blessed and holy, in proportion to the spirit of faith that is in him, but faith is a grace of degree, and only that degree which giveth the *victory* over the world comprises the blessedness and holiness here commended,



Digitized by Google

and constitutes its possessors *overcomers*. After the same manner are they pronounced specially blessed who are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb. (See Rev. xix. 9.)

The Apostle to the Hebrews, in speaking of the rest, or keeping of Sabbath to the people of God, suggests a possibility of coming short of it, and however the rest of faith may here be implied, the rest of millennial glory, the creation's Sabbath, the seventh thousand years of its history, is the rest here spoken of "that remaineth to the people of God." (Heb. iv. 9.) And if these words inspire hope, not less do those teach wholesome fear, where we read, "Take heed, brethren, *lest;* Exhort one another daily, *lest;* We are made partakers of Christ (that is of His glory) *if;* Let us therefore fear, *lest;* Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, *lest.*" Indeed, the whole tenor of these third and fourth chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews suggests possibility of failure, and gives warning against it. Not of final salvation, but of the prize of our high and holy calling, a part with him in his kingdom and glory. Here also we come to see a fulness of meaning in the words: "If we be dead with him, we shall also live with him; if we suffer, we shall also reign with him," and "The dead in Christ shall rise first." Now the *dead* in Christ are those who have *lived* in Christ; but do all believers *live* in Christ? All believers living and dying in the faith of Christ shall rise to live eternally with him, but the object of the present inquiry is that order of rising and living with Christ which will ensure *reigning* with him. Every queen shares the throne with the king, and their time of crowning is one. So we read the Bride is to share the throne with the Bridegroom when he shall come in his own glory and his Father's. (Rev. iii. 21.) But only if we be dead with him now, shall we live with him *then;* only if we suffer with him now, shall we reign with him *then;* "for, if we believe not, he abideth faithful, he cannot deny himself." So persuaded were the believers in the early church of this truth, that with a view to reigning with Christ, martyrdom was even coveted and sought, rather than avoided. Not necessarily, however, need overcomers be martyrs of the order described in Heb. xi. 35-38; but those who have carried a cross for Christ, those who have put off the old man with his deeds, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts, have suffered shame and disrepute for the truth's sake, having bought the truth at great cost, and refused to sell it again even to recover a lost reputation with the world or their brethren. Such as, being cast out for the truth's sake, have found consolation in the words understood by so few: "Your brethren that hated you, and that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified; but he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed" (Isa. lxvi. 5); for the same thing that has been going on from the beginning, continues still, and shall to to the end.

But it may yet be asked by some, Upon what special Scriptures

Digitized by Google

do you rely for a *first* resurrection? We answer, First, upon the apostle's anxiety already quoted from Phil. iii. 11, noting especially the right reading, "*from among* the dead." Second, his language to the Thessalonians, 1 Ep. iv. 16; and Third, John's testimony in Rev. xx. 5, 6, than which we can conceive of nothing more definite; and this we must consider part and parcel of the *first* thing that shall shortly come to pass, seeing that the change of the living and the raising of the dead are to happen simultaneously, in the twinkling of an eye, the briefest point of time that can be expressed—and for participation in either of which *readiness* is enjoined.

Then Abel, the first to lose his life for righteousness; and Enoch, the seventh from Adam, who walked with God, and was not, for God took him, as a type of all who should on that account become translated that they should not see death; together with all the happy succession of witnesses, down to the saint who latest fell asleep, wake from their long sleep of death, and together with those who are alive and remain, will be caught away to meet the Lord in the air. We will here just hazard the expression of a thought we have entertained for years on this matter, for which we have indeed no express revelation, but which in the very nature of things appears to us not only feasible, but likely; that, whenever the time draws near—say, within a year, two, or three —the Lord may spare his loved ones the pain of dying by detaining them on the earth to partake at length in the rapture of the living and changed saints. Where he has seen an earnest (perhaps life-long) looking and longing for his appearing, coupled with a hope to escape the last enemy, we think it not improbable that his love toward them may be shown after this order; and surely the thought that such might be, should prove an additional incentive to entertain the lively hope and expectation.

But some will say, Does not Romans viii. 17 say, "If children then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ?" What more than new birth is needed? Yes; but it adds, "if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." And just before it says, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God, but as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the *sons of God*." Observe, too, that all sons are not heirs. Abraham, the father of the faithful, "had two sons, the one by a bond maid, the other by a free woman; but he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh, but he of the free woman was by promise; which things are an allegory." In Abram's household Eliezer was heir for a while (Gen. xv. 3,) until Ishmael was born. Then Ishmael was heir until Isaac was born, and Sarah is found saying, "Cast out this bondwoman and her son, for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir." (Gen. xxi. 10.) Eliezer was a faithful servant, and had reward according to his service doubtless, but no part in the inheritance which was to come by promise. Ishmael was a son, and



Digitized by Google

although cast out at first with only bread and water, the prayer of faith was not unanswered; he became a nation, twelve princes his sons came to be, having towns and castles according to their nations; but no part in the inheritance which was to come by promise. And why? Because the children of promise are counted for the seed. First the *inheritance* is given to Abraham by promise (Gen. xii. 7), and then a *seed* is given to him by promise (Gen. xv. 5), a promised inheritance for a promised seed. And who are the children of promise? Those who, seeing the promised inheritance afar off, are persuaded of the promises, and embrace them, and confess that they are strangers and pilgrims on the earth, and they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. Those who, walking in the steps of the faith of their father Abraham become Isaacs—*offered ones*—and Israels, as princes to have power with God, and with men to prevail. The promise was to Abraham and those of his seed who should walk in the steps of his faith. Not the Ishmaels who mock—and let any of our readers who see not with us, and are disposed to treat lightly, if not to ridicule, our hope, beware how they class themselves with the mocker of Isaac—not the Esaus who love sport in the field, and take to themselves many wives of the daughters of Canaan and Heth; and, weary in the pursuit of pleasure, despise their birthright, and sell it for a mess of pottage. But the Isaacs who are *offered ones*, whose habit of life is to pitch their tent by the well Lahai-roi (Thou God seest me!), and build their altar and call upon the name of the Lord in the land wherein they are strangers (Gen. xxvi. 25). And the Jacobs, too, who, after sending their flocks and herds, their wives and children across the brook, are left alone with God to gain the name of Israel. Abraham, the man of faith, could afford to give Lot his choice of country, knowing that, wherever he went, he would build his altar and call upon the name of the Lord, whether his neighbours approved of it or not. But Lot, the man of sense—albeit he was a righteous man—chose the well-watered plains, pitched his tent towards Sodom, and presently was found in Sodom, which well-nigh cost him his life; and, as it was, his sun went down behind a cloud. Will he share in the first resurrection? We think not. For then it will be shown to whom the present mess of pottage has been more than the future glory of a kingdom, who has brought the blind, and the lame, and the halt—what could be spared—for sacrifice; and who has placed his all upon the altar that the Lord might take what pleased him, who has given grudgingly to the Lord his tenth; and who, giving heed to the words of the apostle: "Be not deceived, God is not mocked; whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." And again, "He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly, and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully," having learned that not theirs only, but their own selves must be given to the Lord.

That the Epistle of James was written to the Church is apparent

Digitized by Google

from the frequent repetition of the term "My brethren." But can we for a moment think that those amongst them who needed such sharp reproof and solemn warning as the fourth chapter and first six verses of the fifth chapter presents, if they died as they lived when thus addressed by the Apostles,—can we think that such will share a glorious part in the first resurrection? If we mistake not, *we* have known believers who have so lived and so died, for aught the world or their brethren have known to the contrary.

And, without indulging too censorious a spirit, we think we know, alas, too many to whom the complaints made to the Churches in Asia might be well repeated in the Churches of Europe or America. For, let it not be overlooked nor forgotten that to one class *in the Churches* it is said, "I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love; remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen and repent." And again, "Repent, or I will come unto thee quickly and fight against them with the sword of my mouth." And again, "Be watchful and strengthen the things that are ready to die, for I have not found thy works perfect before God; remember, therefore, how thou hast received, and hold fast, and repent." "If, therefore, thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee." (What evidence we have in this, that these messages to the Churches of Asia were written for *all time!*) And again, to some who were neither cold nor hot, "I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire that thou mayst be rich, and white raiment that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear."

While to another class in the same Churches it is said, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." And again, "He that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations." And again, "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will confess his name before my Father, and before the angels." And again, "He that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and I will write upon him my new name." And again, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne."

Those that have wandered out of the way of understanding (although believers, and found in Church association to the end of their days) shall *remain* in the congregation of the dead, while those that continue in the way of understanding to the end shall share in the *first* resurrection. *When* those shall arise from the dead, and what their portion *then* shall be we must reserve for a future paper; but to this distinction of classes in the Church of the past we call attention as bearing upon resurrection, and in the Church of the present as bearing upon the change at his coming.

But it is time we passed on to the *second* of the "Things that must shortly come to pass," viz.: "The great tribulation wherein

Digitized by Google

"many shall be purified and made white and tried, but the wicked will do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand." (Daniel xii. 10.)

We have seen the foolish virgins "shut out," which to our understanding means, in the case of the dead—*not raised*—in the case of the living—*not changed*—but left behind to seek what sooner they ought to have found, "oil in their vessels with their lamps." Some will doubtless seek it at once by "going to them that sell," having recourse to means of grace ordinary and extraordinary, turning to the Lord with weeping and supplication, repentance and confession, crying, "Lord, Lord, open to us," hoping that he might grant them a second rapture. But no, the door is shut, *that* day of grace is past, that degree of acceptance and approval is lost; but they may yet attain unto the second degree if then they keep the faith, and overcome the beast, his image, his mark, and the number of his name, which must then presently rise out of the sea of trouble, called the tribulation the great one. Then will be better understood than hitherto Luke xxi. 36: "Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man." Their brethren comprising the little flock, or flock of little ones, the flock of slaughter, that have gone up, *have* been accounted worthy to escape, and will be then standing before the Son of man in his revealed glory. Those who have had their life for the most part in the earth must remain on the earth, while those who have found their life in him, and lived it, shall be caught away to meet him, having (it may be) seen this to be the hope of their calling, and followed after it, if they might apprehend that for which they had been apprehended of Christ Jesus, and so pressed toward the mark for the prize of their high calling of God in Christ Jesus, even to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as the bride of Christ at the marriage supper of the Lamb.

Hackney. N. STARKEY.

(*To be continued.*)

---

## THE ANGEL REAPERS.

"The reapers are the angels."—MATT. xiii. 39.

SOON shall come the angel-reapers,
Lo, their gleaming scythes they whet;
Soon the judgment books will open,
And Messiah's throne be set.

Heaven's commissioned angel-reapers,
In the world's wide harvest field;
Come to reap the whitened harvest,
And to house the precious yield.

Digitized by Google

Soon will come those angel-reapers
Whom the Son of man will send;
Send to gather from his kingdom
All things that therein offend.

Soon will come those awful reapers,
Stern and terrible to view;
Hark! they cry, "Depart, ye cursed—
Who nor truth nor mercy knew."

Then the righteous shall for ever
Shine forth as the mid-day sun,
In the kingdom of their Father,
All their toil and suffering done.

Coming Lord! O let thy warning
Find in us the listening ear;
And a heart of understanding
To discern thine advent near.

* T. W. C.

---

## LAST WORDS ON PSALM CIX.

IN common, I am sure, with other readers of the RAINBOW, I feel indebted to Mr. Strang for his contribution to the number of last January, entitled, "Whose are the Curses of Psalm cix." It has all the interest belonging to an able and sincere exegetical exposition, and I am much disappointed that it has not enabled me to alter in the slightest degree my previous conception of this psalm. On the contrary, I am convinced that anything more completely unsatisfactory than the foundations offered for the support of a new reading and interpretation of this vindictive psalm, it would be difficult to find amid all the discarded rubbish of commentators.

Mr. Strang's arguments, adopted with improvements from Mr. Hammond's "Apology," are of two kinds—textual and moral.

The latter I will not allude to. They are dangerous admissions for any one desirous of maintaining current conceptions of David's inspiration, and corroborative of the theory I have myself advanced.

The textual arguments have three main supports, which, while I now indicate, but I trust the reader will be at the pains to re-peruse in Mr. Strang's paper, in justice to him and the subject.

1st. It is suggested that the psalm is obviously separable into three divisions viz., vers. 1-5, vers. 6-19, vers. 21 to end, with ver. 20 declarative and parenthetical.

The vers. 6-19 are, it is suggested, the quoted language of David's enemies addressed to God in imprecation of the saintly king.

2nd. The corroboration this view receives from a new reading of ver. 20.

3rd. The valuelessness of the support commonly supposed to be derived from Peter's reference to this Psalm in Acts i. 20.

Digitized by Google

I. The change of speakers supposed to take place at ver. 6 is, it is thought, supported by the fact that a change takes place in the pronoun from the plural to the singular—*they* to *he* and *him*—the plural being reverted to at ver. 21.

Mr. Strang refers, in a note, to the fact that a "somewhat similar change of pronouns" occurs in Psa. xxxv. If the reader will refer to this psalm and read from the fourth to the eighth verses, he will see that the change of pronouns is not "somewhat" similar, but exactly similar; and I would refer him to another (Psa. xli.), where David speaks of "mine enemies" in the fifth verse, and in the 6th of one enemy, reverting in the 7th to the plural number.

These two instances are sufficient to answer the "puzzling question" as to the sudden change in verses 5 and 6 of Psalm cix.

It is suggested that "at the beginning of ver. 6 we should understand some such word as 'saying,' to indicate that the curses which follow are quoted from the lips of the psalmist's adversaries." Abundant instances have been adduced by Mr. Strang of the supply of such a word by our translators, and also of quoted words being left to the reader's discernment, without preface or other indication, the context and the words themselves rendering any help to the reader unnecessary.

All this can be freely granted, for it is fully proved; but it fails to decide in favour of Mr. Hammond's interpretation simply because the words in question cannot possibly be understood, by any unprejudiced reader, as proceeding from any other than the writer of the psalm. I must be permitted to quote a few of them.

"Set *thou* a *wicked* man over him: and let *Satan* stand at his right hand. When he shall be *judged*, let him be *condemned;* and let his *prayer* become *sin*. Let the *iniquity* of his fathers be remembered with the *Lord:* and let not the *sin* of his mother be *blotted out*. Let them be before the *Lord* continually, that he may cut off the memory of them from the earth, *Because that he remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even slay the broken in heart.* As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him: *as he delighteth not in blessing*, so let it be far from him."

I have put in italics the words which, I submit, it is quite inconceivable are the quoted utterances of a persecuting enemy of David.

In the first place, the entire passage is an address, if not a prayer, to the Divine Being. Not only does the speaker believe in God, but also in Satan, and has a clear perception that a "wicked man" invested with power is a curse in the earth. He hails the existence of judgment and condemnation for the unmerciful; he acknowledges the great realities of prayer and sin; he believes in iniquity, and that the Lord—the Lord alone—can blot it out, even as he can remember it. His zeal is against one who "delighted not in blessing," but loved cursing. He would that such an one were cut off from the earth "because that he remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even slay the broken in heart."

Now, I would seriously ask Mr. Strang what kind of a wicked man this can be?

Is it a man of God, or a man of Belial who is speaking? I feel that another word is unnecessary, although strongly tempted to enlarge upon

Digitized by Google

the monstrous outrages to our common sense that critics dare to present to English readers in the interests of piety and truth.

2. Verse 20 reads in our translation: "*Let* this *be* the reward of mine adversaries from the Lord, and of them that speak evil against my soul."

Mr. Strang points out that Dr. Adam Clarke would render "This is the work of my adversaries before the Lord," i.e., all that is said from the 6th to the 20th verse, are the imprecations of enemies labouring to set the Lord against David, that their curses may take effect! Now, why does Dr. Clarke think this a "reasonable interpretation?" Surely we may reply without wronging him—Because he imagines it "*frees the whole psalm from every difficulty.*"

We are asked to expunge the italics from our common version and we have, "This the reward of my adversaries from the Lord." Now, could any one reading that sentence by any possibility construe it to mean, as we are told it does mean—"The reward they wish *for me?*"

Well does Perowne say, in effect, that if it was meant to say so, the words, "from Jehovah," should have been left out, and the words, "unto me," substituted. That and that alone would make the meaning clear and intelligible. Perowne's translation of the verse is,—

"This is the reward of mine adversaries from Jehovah."

It is really amazing to notice how critics, who, at times lay such stress upon minute verbal distinctions, will, at others, stick at nothing in the way of suggesting that certain words must be understood, for which, while they completely alter the sense of the original as it stands, they possess not the smallest warrant in the grammar of the passage. It is done under a pious necessity!

Attention is however drawn to the Hebrew word translated "reward," and here a very interesting extract is given us from the *Expositor.*

I own to being struck by the translation of the LXX., *τουτο το εργον των ενδιαβαλλοντων με παρα κυριου*; and by the Vulgate, *Hoc opus eorum qui detrahunt mihi apud Dominum.* It will be perceived that these translations are clearly against the "unto me" theory; but they seem, at first sight, to recommend Dr. Clarke's translation of פעלה by "work," Gesenius also agreeing.

We are then to read, "This is the *work* of my adversaries from Jehovah."

This, Mr. Strang asserts, amounts to a *direct statement* (the italics are his) that the psalmist has been, from the 6th verse, quoting the words of others, and these, the adversaries referred to in ver. 4. Does the reader see it? Upon this let me remark that in all languages, probably, men have expressed the connection they all experience between toil and trouble, work and punishment. In Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English at all events, and with these we are now alone concerned, this is clearly expressed by the words for work being synonyms for inflictions. Thus, in Habakkuk 1, 5, "I will work a work in your days." The work was the raising up of the Chaldees to march through the breadth of the land, "all for violence," because the Lord "had ordained them for judgment and established them for correction." In Acts xiii. the Apostle Paul quotes the passage freely from the Septuagint:—"Ιδετε, *οι καταφρονηται, και θαυμασατε και αφανισθητε· ὅτι ἔργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις*

Digitized by Google

ὑμῶν, ἔργον ᾧ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε, ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται ὑμῖν. "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish; for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you."

Now, here the work of the Lord is a judgment inflicted; and accordingly we find in the Septuagint ἔργον, ἐργάζομαι, the primary meaning of both noun and verb being indeed "work;" but another meaning being in the case of the noun "war, combat," and in the case of the verb "to *inflict evil*." Similarly the Latin word, *opus*, signifies travail as well as work; and in English we hear people say "such a piece of work" I had," when they are speaking of a toothache.

At this distance from the use of Greek and Latin as living languages, who shall say that the Seventy did not well translate the Hebrew by ἐργον, and St. Jerome equally well by *opus?* both of them leaving the context to enforce the secondary meaning, just as in our translation we use a word, "reward," which has two opposite meanings, and we safely leave it to the reader which to understand. The Seventy might of course have used μισθος or μοχθος, and the Latin, *pœna*, and our translators "punishment;" but the context made all clear.

We have seen that the best English translators give the English of the Hebrew as "reward," the context compelling the reader to understand by that "evil desert;" and we have no doubt at all, that ἐργον and *opus* in their contextual position conveyed a similar meaning to the readers of past days. We must hasten to the last buttress of the new reading.

8. Acts i. 16, Mr. Strang contends, is not to be supposed indicative of the psalms quoted in ver. 20. Peter referred to some passage—the words of which he did not quote—and the words, "*this Scripture* must needs have been fulfilled," is a mistranslation, it should be, "*the* Scripture." The reader will judge presently whether it was worth while to parade a host of authorities for the expunction of ταύτην after γραφῆν. I really must be permitted once more to quote, as in the interpretation of Scripture the context is the one indispensable commentator.

"In those days (the days when all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication) Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said, Men and brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David, spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus. For he was numbered with us and obtained part of this ministry. Now, this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder and all his bowels gushed out. And it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem; insomuch as that field is called in their proper tongue Aceldama, that is to say, the field of blood. For it is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein; and his bishopric let another take. Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection."

Will the reader kindly notice attentively the strict logical connection of the whole passage.

The interpretation of Scripture is never to be got at by nibbling at

Digitized by Google

words—the higher and only safe criticism requires a comprehension not alone of syllables, but of circumstances, of what precedes and follows, of the logic of events, of character, of moral certainties—an insight, spiritual and intellectual, and above all, a robust common sense and inflexible honesty of avowal as to the things perceived by the judgment.

Now, is the reader in any doubt as to what Peter is doing when he gets up among the one hundred and twenty? Is he not laying before his hearers Scripture proofs in commendation of the singular and solemn proposition he is going to make—nothing less than the addition to the apostolate of another in the place of fallen Judas? He begins by showing that the Scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which spake of the judgments that should fall upon Judas—typical child of darkness (the δεῖ is emphatic in the original, well translated by "must needs"); and what are these fulfilments he alludes to? According to Luke's understanding of Peter, Judas purchased a field with the reward of iniquity and defiled it with his own bloody corpse. The field that he purchased for a habitation, he left desolate, and because of its defilement no man dwelt therein. In all this Peter, under the inspiration of God, sees an exact fulfilment of what is written in the Book of Psalms: "Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein." It remains to fulfil what is spoken in the 109th Psalm; "His bishopric let another take." "*Wherefore*" we have italicised, but in the original the δεῖ is the emphatic word. The "must" is first. With Peter the authority of the Psalms is everything. They furnish the whole of his motive, the whole of his authority, and the whole of his argument in reference to Judas and his successor—divinely inspired so to regard them. "It must therefore be that of these men which have companied with us, &c., must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection."

A plainer and nobler passage is not in the whole Scriptures. It remained for critics, zealous for orthodoxy, to rob it of sense, force, and logical connection.

Verse 16, it is said, has no connection with verse 20; verse 20 is only a free adaptation of language "appropriate to Peter's purpose," he never meant any one to suppose that Judas was referred to in the Psalms.

There was no "must" in the case at all derivable from the fact that the things that had happened were those things that had been foretold, and that what Peter was now proceeding to do had also been foretold. Verse 16 referred to some passage that Peter did not quote, and we presume, therefore, it is only by accident that the words which he did quote in ver. 20 were exactly those, and none other, which he should have quoted after ver. 16, for they *alone out of all the words spoken by the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David, answer to the circumstances concerning Judas which Peter proceeds to refer to.*

To myself, such a method of treating Scripture, so disrespectful, so obstinate, so frivolous, and so dishonest, excites feelings which it is difficult to express. But who can wonder at the scorn of infidelity, when portions of Scripture, so clear in their logical meaning, as Psalm cix. and the first chapter of the Acts are so grossly maltreated and falsified in the interests of their divine inspiration!

I have no space to allude to the dilemma in which Mr. Strang imagines I am placed by maintaining that Judas was referred to, and, at the

Digitized by Google

same time, that David's utterances are not revelations of God's dealings with the world at large in the future state. I can only assure him that not only is there no inconsistency in maintaining both views, but that both views *must* be held, if the true interpretation of the Scripture is to be gathered.

* HENRY DEACON.

---

## CANON GARBETT ON "THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL."

### III.

WE now approach Canon Garbett's more particular and specified arguments against our doctrine of Conditional Immortality. We shall endeavour to pass over nothing that he has put forward as having any force against us. Our wish and intention is to deal with his arguments so thoroughly as to allow him to claim as an admission on our part anything that he has advanced and that we do not reply to.

1. At p. 841 there is an argument to this effect: He contends, and we admit, that there is a survival of the souls of the wicked as well as of the righteous from the birth and through the death of each individual on to the resurrection and the judgment. "But," says the Canon, "if there will have been no break in life from birth up to the judgment, it amounts to an enormous presumption that there will be no break in continuity afterwards, seeing that the self-same words used to express the life of the righteous after judgment, admitted to be everlasting, are equally used to express the life of the wicked."

There seems to us to be two quite distinct arguments here put rather confusedly into one. One ends with the word "afterwards," and is complete in itself. The other begins with "the self-same words," and is perfectly complete also in itself. It seems to us both illogical and confusing to join the two together by the words "seeing that." We shall notice the latter of the two first. It makes a statement which, were it only true, would settle the controversy for ever so far as we are concerned. Indeed, we cannot account for the Canon's words that immediately follows:—"That this may not amount to a positive proof of absolute eternity of being we have just admitted." To us it would amount to a positive proof of absolute eternity of being, *if it were true*. But we ask, is it true? We distinctly say, it is not—"that the self-same words used to express the life of the righteous after judgment, admitted to be everlasting, are equally used to express the *life* of the wicked?" If he had said "the *punishment* of the wicked" or the *destruction* of the wicked," he would have spoken correctly enough, but by writing "life" instead of "punishment" or "destruction," he obviously not only makes a misstatement as to a simple matter of fact, but begs the whole question. Did our Lord or any inspired writer ever say "The wicked shall go into everlasting life," "They shall be punished

Digitized by Google

with everlasting life," "They shall live for ever in misery or in hell?" If he did, the case is indeed settled against us, but not otherwise.

But now for the "enormous presumption" argument. It is, we suspect, this that the Canon speaks of as possibly "not amounting to a positive proof of absolute eternity of being." But is even the presumption in favour of it so very enormous? Because some souls have continued to exist in prison awaiting the judgment for say, six thousand years, does that afford any presumption against the sentence of that judgment being "everlasting destruction" in the sense of being "destroyed for ever?" Because a murderer has been in prison awaiting his trial for months, or even years, does that amount to a presumption against the capital sentence being at length pronounced and executed upon him?

The fact is, that six thousand years' imprisonment in Hades for, we will say, the soul of Cain, especially as contrasted with the no time in Hades for the soul of the last sinner cut off in his sins before the judgment, is a difficulty that presses just as much against Canon Garbett as against us. The only persons who get rid of it altogether are those who deny the existence, or the conscious existence, of the souls of the wicked in the intermediate state. We are not disposed to deny either, any more than Canon Garbett. But we call on him to acknowledge the difficulty as freely as we do, for surely it presses on him as heavily as on us. Unless, indeed, he, being used to the thought of an eternity of torment after the judgment, thinks little or nothing of a few thousand years more or less of comparative misery before it; and unless he gives us credit for not having our feelings blunted in the same way, and to the same degree. On a subject which so little concerns us, and on which so little has been revealed, we prefer to say little, and to leave the matter in all its difficulty to God. But we may humbly speculate as to how the difficulty might be solved. We can imagine Cain's soul in the Hades state to be so constituted—it may be according to the nature of a disembodied soul—as to have little or no sense of duration or consciousness of the lapse of time. Or we can suppose, indeed we cannot doubt, that if there is so much sense of duration and so much endurance of comparative misery, even in the way of anticipation of the coming doom, as to be worth taking into account, it will be taken into account in mitigation of the judgment doom to be inflicted, in making the stripes few that otherwise would be many. It is so with righteous earthly judges. It is counted righteousness as well as mercy in them. Why should we doubt that it will be so in the case of the Lord, the Righteous Judge of quick and dead?

In connection with this "enormous presumption" argument, and after the admission that "it may not amount to positive proof of absolute eternity of being," we read, "But the presumption is all in its favour; for meanwhile the argument adduced in disproof is shattered into pieces, and leaves the great Catholic doctrine of the immortality of the soul untouched in all its grandeur and blessedness." We have looked carefully again and again through all that precedes this for anything that might be taken for the shattering into pieces of any argument adduced on our side in disproof of absolute eternity of being for all mankind. We cannot find even one of the pieces into which it has been shattered. We do not know what argument on our side is alluded to. The Canon's

Digitized by Google

argument was a positive presumptive argument from the soul's existence for some thousands of years before the judgment to its existence to all eternity after the judgment. But it touched no counter argument of ours. Unless, indeed, he supposes here, as he actually asserted before, that we deny the soul's existence between death and resurrection. But since this is not denied on our part, his presumptive argument has nothing in it to shatter any argument of ours; as assuredly it has no weight whatever with those who do deny it.

But whatever our argument may be, which is, as the Canon says, shattered into pieces, we are told that it "leaves the great Catholic doctrine of the immortality of the soul untouched in all its grandeur and blessedness." Now, on this we remark—(1) that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is not, properly speaking, a Catholic doctrine. It has, we admit, been a Roman Catholic doctrine for centuries. But this is not what the Canon means. He means, doubtless, catholicity in the sense of the old formula, "quod semper, quod ubique, et quod omnibus." St. Vincent's "quod semper," which is the most important and most reasonable of the three "quods," most certainly does not apply to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as held in the Christian church. It would, I think, be more exactly what Canon Garbett means if he called it "the great traditional doctrine." We maintain that it is neither primitive nor scriptural.

But (2) as to "its grandeur and blessedness"—does the Canon use these terms distributively, applying "its blessedness" to the saved and "its grandeur" to the lost? Or does he ignore altogether its horror unspeakable as regards the lost? It certainly ill becomes him to speak of "the immortality of the soul in its blessedness and grandeur" as assailed by us when he knows perfectly that so far as it can be called "blessed," and so far as it can be called "grand," except in the grimmest and most unseemly humour, we Conditionalists admit it to the full, and moreover, that we base this truly Catholic doctrine of the immortality of the saved, or, in other words, of conditional immortality in all its admitted and undeniable blessedness and grandeur, on the sure foundation of the word of God.

2. On pp. 843-6 there is an argument which amounts to this—that death does not mean annihilation, therefore, the soul is immortal and will live for ever. This argument, we observe, as Canon Garbett uses it, applies equally to the body. He maintains "that in no case, not even in the case of the body, does death mean annihilation, or the going into nothing. It is, indeed, deliberately and persistently argued that the body in this sense perishes at death. But it is a palpable fallacy, and admits of ready disproof." But, really, annihilation is not our word. It is flung at us. It does not emanate from us. When we use the Scripture words, perishing, destruction, death, as applied to the soul and body of the wicked in hell, traditionalists go away and say we are preaching annihilation. We take this very good humouredly, for we believe that in most cases no harm or wrong is meant. Still it is rather hard to have the word fastened on us in all its strict philosophical meaning.

We would observe further that the Canon's argument applies, with all the force that is in it, not only to human bodies, but to the bodies of

Digitized by Google

birds and beasts as well. And most assuredly there is not a shade of difference between Canon Garbett and us as to the result of death in either the body of man or the body of a bird or a beast. We all believe that none of these bodies vanishes into nothing, or even into thin air, as soon as death takes place. And yet we do not think the Scriptures are wrong when they speak of "the beasts that perish," nor can we see that we are any more wrong in saying that man, so far as his body is concerned, perishes at the first death. No more can we see anything in the Canon's argument to prevent our holding, as we do, that unregenerate men will perish both soul and body at the second death.

Throughout these same pages (843-6) we find the expression, "if death be annihilation," occurring again and again. It has as much concern with us as if the Canon had said instead, "if death be life," or "if death be happiness." We allow it to be said for us that the death of the lower animals is annhilation, and that the second death of the wicked will be annihilation. Anything else we object to. Let Canon Garbett try the experiment of using what we really hold, instead of what we do not, in argument against us, and see what he will make of it. For instance, "If" (not "*death*" but) "*the second death* be annihilation, then of course, in the natural order of things Adam would have passed out of existence at the moment of his sin," &c. This, of couse, would be sheer nonsense in the way of argument, because we do not hold that Adam died the second death either then or ever. Again, "If" (not "*death*" but) "*the second death* be annihilation, and yet every human soul survives, then no human being has ever yet died." This also would be evident nonsense, unless, indeed, the conclusion meant "then no human being has ever yet died the second death," in which case it would be a truism that no one would be found to dispute.

3. Having argued to his own satisfaction, and with our entire concurrence, that death, i.e., the first death, is not the utter cessation of existence, the Canon goes on to build upon this conclusion, the further statement that "neither can life be mere existence, simple being, and no more." We would be very sorry to think it was. We never thought so even in the case of a dog. A stone has "mere existence, simple being, and no more," but it has no life. A living dog has something more than mere existence and simple being. It has consciousness, it has feelings and affections, it has much that makes life enjoyable to it, and that would make it wanton cruelty to put it to death unnecessarily. How much more is it with man that life is something more than "mere existence, simple being." Why, life, if unattended with disease or pain, and unalloyed with sin, is and must ever be intense enjoyment. And to live for ever without sin and without pain or unrest of mind or body is a wondrous gift of God in Christ to death-doomed men. But we go further, and exult in the belief that all who by God's gift are to live for ever will live in perfect positive happiness, as well as perfect holiness. This last article of our faith and hope we do not found merely on our conceptions of the bare meaning of life even when sinless and painless, but on the promises of our God, that go along with the promise of eternal life. For instance, "In thy presence is the fulness of joy, and at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore;" "enter thou into the joy of thy Lord;" "glory and honour" are set before us as well as "immortality;"

Digitized by Google

"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered into the heart of man what God hath prepared for them that love Him." Can we not build our hopes of everlasting happiness securely enough on such Scriptures as these, along with the oft repeated promise of living for ever, of not dying, of eternal life, of abiding for ever—even while we deny the immortality of the souls of the wicked? Do we indeed "perilously weaken the proof of everlasting happiness when we deny the correlative truth of everlasting suffering in hell?" We think not. If, indeed, "everlasting suffering in hell" were revealed in the same page or in the same Bible with "the everlasting happiness" of heaven, our disbelief of the one would weaken our faith in the other. But that is what we most strenuously deny.

But the Canon's argument here seems to be more exactly this: that unless we leave the word "life" to mean "not bare existence, but existence in bliss," we have no texts of Scripture, or only three at the most, which afford us "the certain hope of an everlasting reward."

All this is so extraordinary to us, and must seem so to our readers, that we think it well to quote the following passage which puts Canon Garbett's meaning beyond a doubt:—"The impression naturally existing upon the mind is 'that the doctrine of everlasting happiness in heaven pervades the Word of God everywhere, in passages so abundant as to be beyond numeration.' It is true; but it is only true on the supposition of the immortality of the soul, and that life means not bare existence, but existence in bliss." (p. 846.) And so he says further on (p. 847), "On Conditionalist principles there is not one explicit passage in the entire Word of God, which directly and categorically asserts the everlasting happiness of the redeemed in heaven." He admits, indeed, that on our principles there are "three texts on which the certain hope of an everlasting reward can be founded." One of these three is not specified, as it is mysteriously hustled out of court by the adoption of "the argument applied by Conditionalists to Mark ix. 43, viz.: that the eternal duration of a state does not involve the eternal duration of those who are placed in it." The other two are Rev. xxi. 4, and Isa. xxv. 8. But these he considers "are in one sense repetitions of each other;" and so we suppose should be counted as only one. But from these two counted as one, or even from the words "there shall be no more death," he admits that "we may certainly draw the inference that the saints will live for ever in heaven: but it is only an inference. On Conditionalist principles there is not one explicit passage in the entire Word of God which directly and categorically asserts the everlasting happiness of the redeemed in heaven."

Now what is his proposed remedy for this supposed deficiency of promise—from our point of view—of an everlasting reward? It is this. Let the immortality of the soul be assumed, i.e., let it be assumed that, according to the natural meaning of those words, all men will "live for ever," that all men "have eternal life." Well then, as living for ever, and eternal life and immortality are predicated and promised in Scripture conditionally on men being in Christ, let these expressions be used, as in that case they must, according to a certain "usus loquendi" of Scripture, i.e., not in their natural sense. Let this "usus loquendi" be "existence in bliss," and let "life" wherever it occurs in Scripture be used in this sense. Then, and then only we shall be sure, not as a mere

Digitized by Google

"inference" which might otherwise be "certainly drawn," "that the saints will live for ever in heaven," and enjoy everlasting happiness there.

But we may ask where is there, on traditionalist principles, "one explicit passage in the entire Word of God, which directly and categorically asserts" the immortality of the soul of man, or that all men will live for ever? Canon Garbett admits that there is not one. It is all assumption with him and his school. And yet this baseless assumption, which is utterly contradicted by many, lies at the foundation—is an essential part of the foundation of all his hopes of everlasting happiness. It will not do, we suppose he thinks, for the world to rest on the elephant alone. But put the tortoise under the elephant and all will be right. Just as it will not do for our hopes of future and eternal happiness to rest on God's promises of eternal life, of no more death, no more sorrow, no more pain, of pleasures for evermore at his right hand. These are not "explicit" enough; they do not directly and categorically assert the everlasting happiness of the redeemed." But put the immortality of the soul underneath and all will be well. It is true it is not asserted or even hinted at in Scripture. It rests only on assumption. But how unkind to mention this, or to inquire on what the tortoise rests!

Admitting, for argument's sake, all he says about our position in this respect, we ask whether our position is not vastly more reasonable and safe than his? Ours, in holding what no believer in God's Word has ever doubted, what it would be alike ungracious and unreasonable in the extreme to doubt for a moment, that they to whom God has promised eternal life in Christ, a life to be attended with no more pain or sorrow, or hunger, or thirst, but with pleasures for evermore, and to be no more threatened with death—that they shall be everlastingly happy, as well as everlastingly alive. Or his, in basing his hopes of a happy eternity on the assumption that all men have an inalienable immortality of which the Scriptures never utter a word, which men without revelation have denied as a truth of human nature, and which devout believers in God's Word have denied to be a truth of revelation.

But we find that Canon Garbett does not adopt his own expedient for assuring himself and others of everlasting happiness in heaven. On p. 841, as we have already noticed, he speaks of "the life of the wicked," and his words imply their everlasting life after judgment. This surely does not mean their "existence in bliss." And we fear he often tells his unregenerate hearers, most unscripturally as we hold, that they will live for ever, and about their immortal, never-dying souls. His mind is no doubt deeply imbued with Scriptural truth and language. Still he has not brought himself to adopt altogether what he considers the Scriptural "usus loquendi," and so he uses occasionally just like ourselves such words as "life," "living," and "never dying," in their natural and obvious sense.

The Rev. Joseph Cook, in one of his remarkable Monday lectures, at Boston, tells us of one who on the deck of a Mississippi steamer was asked what is transcendentalism? and replied,—"See the holes made in the bank yonder by the swallows. Take away the bank and leave the apertures, and this is trancendentalism." The little feat seems to be contemplated by Canon Garbett, in connection with the word life and the happiness that goes along with it. "Take away the life and leave the



Digitized by Google

happiness, and think of that alone when you read of life in the Word of God." Ordinary people will still think of life and happiness as two distinct, yet, blessed be God, in the case of the redeemed and their eternal life, two closely connected ideas.

Douglas. W. J. HOBSON.

(*To be continued.*)

---

## A WITNESS OF THE LAST CENTURY.

THE name of the Rev. Capel Berrow, sometime Rector of Rossington, Nottinghamshire, is best—where at all—known as the author of a treatise on the curious but not very helpful subject of the pre-existence of human souls. Indeed, beyond the facts that he was in 1733 head scholar of Merchant Taylor's School, took his degree of M.A. of Christ Church, Cambridge, in 1758, became a clergyman of the Church of England, wrote the above-mentioned treatise, "*A Lapse of Human Souls in a state of Pre-existence,*" and died in October 1782, hardly anything is known about him. He wrote, however, several other tracts and dissertations which were published in a quarto volume in 1772; to one of the most remarkable of which, entitled, "On Predestination, Election, Reprobation, and Future Punishment," we propose here to direct attention; some of the opinions expressed being not only greatly in advance of those of his own day, but approximating closely to the conclusions of some of the writers in the RAINBOW.

I. In the first place we find that Mr. Berrow utterly *repudiated the doctrine of eternal torment.* On this point he writes as follows:—"The doctrine of eternal torments can by no means be found to coincide with the infinite *justice* of God, even if (as is asserted) we allow them most likely to effectuate a more general obedience to his laws. For supposing that even nineteen out of twenty, from the dread of the extremity of such a punishment, would be withheld from a flagrant commission of evil, how will that consideration serve to mitigate the severity of God's dealings towards the remaining *everlasting tormented miserable?* nay, will it not seem, on the contrary, to come with a more pointed and unfeeling fury? The unhappy wretch is punished with the most exquisite and never-ending torments for temporary crimes. And why? Not that the crimes themselves do in reality deserve so severe and so shocking a vengeance; but, for the *sake of others*, his fellow sinners, it is thought *convenient* by the *all wise* and *merciful* Creator, that it should be inflicted on him!

"Such being the state of the case, with respect to the supposed justice and equity of the Deity, in inflicting eternal torments on the wicked, *supposing* them most likely to effectuate a more general obedience to his laws; let us in the next place see whether the doctrine itself is in reality calculated, beyond any other method whatever, for accomplishing the end proposed from it; and this will lead me to consider Dr. Jenkin's poistion:—

Digitized by Google

"'It is necessary,' says he 'that eternal punishment should be inflicted on the wicked according to the sanction of the divine laws, by eternal rewards and punishments. We find,' he observes, 'by sad experience, how little effect the punishments now threatened have upon too many men, and if they were less dreadful they would be so much the less regarded.'

"In answer to this surmise, I must beg leave to ask, whether a denunciation of temporal punishments, for temporal crimes, might not be supposed to answer the end of God's moral government of the world, and his scheme to restrain vice, full as well as the doctrine of endless torments? a question this which may reasonably enough be answered in the affirmative, from the following consideration, viz., that no doctrine operates so powerfully, and with so great advantage, upon men's minds in general, as that of which they can at once perceive the *reasonableness*, and its consistency with the laws of equity and strict justice. Apply then this maxim to the matter in hand, and upon the question, whether an eternity of torments will ensue from *temporal* crimes, or a *temporal* punishment only, let us consider which is most likely to be believed by the *discerning*, and of consequence which of the two will most probably be attended to? A doctrine of endless torments raises at once in the mind the idea of a hard saying, to which none but those actuated by a blind, implicit faith in the expounders of revelation can possibly be prevailed upon to give the least degree of credit. But that temporal crimes will, with all due severity be punished, and with torments which will be of no *inconsiderable* duration, what man of any kind of reason and understanding will pretend to dispute? Press, therefore, this consideration with the utmost force upon the mind of the wayward reprobate, and he will, if he takes upon himself to reflect at all, think with seriousness, on the solemn and alarming truth; whereas the *incredibility* of the doctrine of *eternal* torments will be more apt to drive him into such a kind of sceptical uncertainty concerning his future fate as may terminate in a total indifference about it. I am, therefore, far from believing that the doctrine itself is 'calculated, beyond any other method, for securing a due obedience to the laws of God;' I rather imagine that the direct contrary will be the more general consequence arising from it."

II. On the subject of *the Divine intention in creation and redemption*, Mr. Berrow's remarks are equally unambiguous; and, indeed, contain the germ of that sublime reconciliation of Calvinism and Arminianism more fully taught in recent years by Thomas Erskine, of Linlathen, and Mr. Henry Dunn; namely, that the election of the New Testament, where it must be regarded as personal, is not to the *final exclusion* but for the *ultimate benefit* of the mass of mankind. Mr. Berrow writes:—

"That the all-merciful Creator could have no other *views* and *designs*, in giving existence to man, than to make him *capable at least* of acquiring happiness, no one will dare to dispute, who doubts not of the infinite justice, benignity, and mercy of God. . . . To imagine, with the Calvinists, that God absolutely *decreed*, before the foundation of the world, *eternal happiness* to *some* of his creatures, but to the remainder *everlasting* misery; and that merely in order to give a scope for the display of his *prerogative*, as Lord of all, is to form in our minds an idea of *partiality* in Deity, than which there cannot be one more horrid. For granting



Digitized by Google

only, what it would be a kind of blasphemy not to allow, that God cannot but *will* happiness *indiscriminately* and without *exception*, to *all* to whom he imparts a rational existence, it necessarily follows, that if misery happens to be the future fate of *any*, it results not from the *will*, or the over-ruling *decree* of heaven.

"The Creator decrees, indeed, infamy and misery to vice, and glory, honour, and immortality to virtue; but do those respective decrees *predestinate* or predetermine this man to the *choice* of the former, or that man to the *pursuit* of the latter? Certainly not,—nor can, therefore, either decree fix the final fate of the one or the other. . . . If, however, any arguments should be drawn in proof of partial personal decrees, agreeably to the Calvinistic idea of predestination, from the predictions concerning Jacob and Esau, viz., that the elder should serve the younger —or from God's declaration that he *loved* Jacob and *hated* Esau, it is necessary to observe, that both circumstances respected *temporal* blessings only, and were fulfilled, not in themselves *personally*, but in their *posterities*. And the declared partiality in the latter case, implied only a predetermined intention in the Divine mind to make the *posterity* of the *one* his *peculiar* people to the *exclusion* of the other; and this in furtherance of a preconcerted scheme for rendering *partial* decrees, in those cases, promotive, in the end, of that one universal good, viz., the redemption of man, on the terms of that dispensation to which those decrees were apt *leadings*."

III. Another point on which Mr. Berrow held very decided opinions was the probability of a *post mortem probation* for the unenlightened in this life. Thus he writes: "It seems not to me reconcilable with God's honour and glory, to be in so great a degree defeated, as the melancholy departure of numberless souls from *this* life implies, supposing their departure to fix their final and *eternal* doom. May we not more reasonably imagine, therefore, that even a state of punishment will be probational, (at least to those who come not under the condemnation of Heb. x. 26, 27,) and that the sinner, when he goes hence, will sooner or later meet with opportunities of appeasing the wrath of heaven? A life of sin and impiety, not properly atoned for, will be undoubtedly succeeded by some other state of existence wherein the unrepenting wicked will, in a most terrible manner, be punished. And the nature of that punishment is in such shocking terms of torment described to us in Holy Writ, as cannot but awaken and alarm the most hardened and obdurate heart, when but seriously listened to and reflected upon. But then, if through the severity of punishment, happily productive at *last* of the wished-for effect, the offender shall see into the folly of sin, and cease to offend more, shall he not receive the proper reward of that most proper conduct? The future punishment of sin will be, both in *nature*, *duration*, and *degree*, most assuredly such as shall give a sufficient display of God's *justice*; and the issue of it, in length of time, a course of reflection, of repentance, and reformation most certainly, which will open a way to his mercy.

"Would not an irrevocable sentence to eternal misery imply an act of severity in the Deity which must necessarily break in upon his own happiness? Undoubtedly, yes; unless we are to suppose such a stoical apathy in the Deity, as will divest him of all affections whatever.

Digitized by Google

How undisturbed he may be—to speak in the language of men—by any *temporary* miseries his creatures may labour under, and that for their good, we can understand; yet can he be alike unaffected by their supposed *eternal* miseries, *not* inflicted for their good? To banish for ever from his enlivening presence; and not only this, but to assign over, to a state of endless and insupportable torments, creatures whom he formed after his own image; to view them, with an unpitying eye, wallowing in gulfs of liquid fire, and lifting up in vain their hands and eyes for mercy; to stifle at once and for ever, the sympathetic workings of the tender parent, and to summon up, in their stead, all the merciless unfeelings of an angry, revengeful, and implacable judge; and for what? To reclaim and reform the apostate reprobate? To reduce to a due obedience the perverse and infatuated rebel? To recover to him his departed reason? To purify his debased nature, and to save at last that which was lost? This were a kind severity, every way worthy of a God of infinite mercy to exert. But to *punish*, never again to *pardon*; to revenge himself of, not meaning by such revenge to *reform* in the mean time the unhappy delinquent; to exert a merciless rage towards some, out of a partial regard toward others, is an idea of the Deity—how shocking! How dissonant from his supposed nature, and the attributes of him whose brightest and most essential perfection is *mercy*; and whose mercy as the royal psalmist tells us, is *everlasting*.

"Hear what the great Dr. Thomas Burnet says upon this point:—'Torments that know no end, can be of no benefit either to God or man; apparently not to man, if there be no room left for repentance, no *possibility* of being *bettered* by his punishment, no respite to his pains, or such an intermission of them as might perhaps open a way to reflection, and put him upon contriving how to alter his nature and condition. Let his punishment be, if you will, full of bitterness, or cutting to the last degree; be it continued, if you please, from day to day; but, for God's sake, let it some time or other have an end, or I cannot conceive how it can possibly be of any consequence at all.' *

"In opposition to which kind of reasoning, it is however urged,—that this world is our state of trial, and the *present* life the time in which we are to work out our salvation, and that the *Scripture* gives us no hopes that if we neglect it we can retrieve things in Hades,—that there are several passages in the Old Testament which are inconsistent with any expectation of the kind, viz.—

"'In death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks' (Psa. vi. 5).

"'The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence (Psa. cxv. 17).

"'There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, whither thou goest' (Eccles. ix. 10).

"'In the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be' (Eccles. xi. 3).

"But these are passages of Scripture upon which no stress can be laid in proof of the *irreversibleness* of our fate when we go hence; but are such as rather weaken than confirm the supposed credibility of it. . . .

* Burnet, *De stat Mort*, p. 290.

Digitized by Google

Even supposing, but not granting, from the above texts, that the state intermediate between death and the day of judgment will be a state of absolute silence, insensibility, and inactivity, does it follow therefrom that there will be no room for thought, recollection, repentance, and amendment in that state of punishment to be portioned out to the wicked at the resurrection; *at the resurrection*, I say, when they are to 'receive the things done in their bodies?' But those texts above quoted do not even prove that the state intermediate between death and the day of judgment, will be a state of silence, insensibility, and inactivity, since those passages were penned with no view at all to determine anything positive as to the *state of the dead*, a circumstance in those *infant* days of the church not yet fully revealed or ordinarily talked of, but as reasonable *monitions* only respecting the duty of *the living*."

IV. In connection with this "larger hope" it is very interesting to find the important distinction between the *present calling of the Church* to the *inheritance of the kingdom of God*, and the *final salvation* of the mass of the human race, very clearly recognised by our author. Indeed it would seem to have been first suggested by him among modern theologians. He says,—"In support of the opinion—of the absolutely irreversible character of future punishment—the argument usually thought most conclusive and unanswerable is—that the term *αἰώνιον*, significant, as is supposed, of a duration of time *without end*, is applied by St. Matthew to that sentence which he says will be passed upon the wicked and the righteous respectively, at the day of judgment: "These shall go away *εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον*, into everlasting punishment: but the righteous *εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, into life eternal."

"This being an objection to the belief of a future *limitation* of torments in reserve for the wicked, which even the most ingenious among the patrons of such persuasion have hitherto been at a great loss how to reply to sufficiently and satisfactorily, it may be thought perhaps to argue no small degree of vanity in me to engage in the arduous task, to aim at surmounting a difficulty to which men of distinguished abilities have as yet been found unequal. But as an attempt to vindicate the honour and attributes of the Deity,—so much involved as they appear to be in the present inquiry,—it is, for the truth's sake, venial at least, if not altogether laudable; and it is to be hoped that those, whom haply I may not be able to bring over to my own opinion, will decline discharging upon me those severe and cutting reflections which are too usually in great plenty bestowed upon those who dare to think for themselves. To proceed then,—

"The epithet *αἰώνιον* by which St. Matthew represents to us the duration of that state of happiness and misery which will be portioned out to the righteous and wicked at the day of judgment respectively, seems, I think, to intimate, by its being used in several places of Scripture, where we are assured a *limited* duration was intended, that the *latter* will consist, in like manner as will the *former*, at first of some *successive* periods of existence. . . . Nor does it appear to me, from anything I can gather from our Saviour's Gospel that he makes the fixed *final state* of either the *good* or the *bad*, the *immediate* subject of his ministry; but an *assurance* only that prior to both, prior to the final state of either the good or the bad, *a share in his own kingdom* will be

Digitized by Google

the happy portion of the one, and *a deprivation of or exclusion from it*, in a place of temporary pains and torments, the melancholy and unhappy fate of the other.

"It is observable, I say, to an attentive reader, that our Saviour's main design, while here on earth, was to fit and prepare men for an inheritance in *that* kingdom,—an opening only to the *final state* of the blessed,—which, in length of time, he was to *receive from the Father*, and which is sometimes called by him, the kingdom of God and of the Father, sometimes the kingdom of heaven, and at other times the kingdom of God and of Christ. Of this same opinion was apparently the great *Mede*, who positively asserts, that the *kingdom of heaven* and *of Christ*, so frequently mentioned in Scripture, is the same with the kingdom of a *thousand* years. 'It will follow,' says he, that 'whatsoever Scripture speaks of a kingdom of Christ to be at his second appearance, or at the destruction of Antichrist, it must needs be the same which Daniel describes (chap. vii.), and *saw* should be at that time, and so consequently be the kingdom of a thousand years, which the Apocalypse includes between the beginning and consummation of the great judgment.' Therefore, referring to Luke xvii., from verse 20 to the end; Luke xix., from verse 11 to 15; xxi. 31, 'When ye see these things come to pass, know,' &c. 'See,' says he, 'what went before,' viz., 'The Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory,' borrowed from Daniel. And that in 2 Tim. iv. 1, 'I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom.'

"'By these,' says he, 'we may understand the rest, taking this for a sure ground, that this expression of the Son of Man's coming in the clouds of heaven, so often inculcated in the New Testament, is taken from and hath reference to, the prophecy of Daniel; it is nowhere else to be found in the Old Testament. As our Saviour also calls himself so frequently the Son of Man, because Daniel so called him in that vision of the great judgment; and that we might look for the accomplishment of what is there prophesied of him.'"*

"And we find that our Saviour in his excellent sermon on the mount, directs most of his arguments and exhortations, with a principal view *to that kingdom he was to receive from the Father;* and points out to his hearers the particular qualifications that would be deemed necessary to entitle men to a *possession* therein. 'Blessed are the poor in spirit,' says he, 'for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.' 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall'—do what? Why, they shall 'see God.' Intimating that the kingdom of heaven before alluded to, and *the vision of God*, were to be considered as two different and distinct states of happiness; that poverty of spirit, meekness, and such like pacific virtues would be found requisite to entitle men to the possession of the *former*, but that absolute *purity* alone could enable them to become partakers of the latter. That the vision of God could be obtained or enjoyed by the pure in heart only, or by those who, as St. John expresses it, 'shall be like him'—shall be pure as he is pure. This *similitude* it is to be presumed, they will

* Mede's Letter to Dr. Meddus.

Digitized by Google

be, in some sort, trained up to in the kingdom of Christ, which is meant to be *introductory* to the vision of God.

"Now that our similitude with God, and of consequence our final *full fruition* of happiness, will not take place in that kingdom of heaven and of Christ so frequently made mention of and alluded to in the Scriptures, is plain, because all that glory is to be done away, its continuance to be upon *earth* for a *limited* time only, and the kingdom afterwards to be delivered up to God even the Father.

"This therefore being granted me to be the case, to the contrary of which there is not, that I can find, any one express declaration from Holy Writ, it may easily be conceived why St. Matthew should make use of the same epithet to denote the duration of the state, to be allotted to the wicked and the righteous respectively, at the day of judgment; without supposing it in either case determinative of *eternity*. And when St. John says, Rev. xix. 20, that the devil, that deceived the nations, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων—it is plain, that those expressions even cannot be meant to imply an *eternal* state, because the same words are made use of by Daniel to denote the duration of the saints' abode upon earth, after the first resurrection; which, he says, is to be εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, which our translation terms for *ever and ever;* and yet that kingdom, we are well assured, must have an *end*, must be delivered up to God, even the Father."

V. But however broad and advanced his views, Mr. Berrow was far indeed from meriting the reproach of *unduly mitigating the just judgments of God;* on the contrary, his language on this point is of almost unwarranted strength and harshness.

"Will it follow," he asks, "from a rejection of the horrid doctrine of eternal torments, that the sinner shall not be tormented at all? Or that the punishment he is to expect will be too short and trivial to give reason for any painful apprehensions about it? Nay, will it follow that he shall not be punished in a most exquisite and intolerable degree? Will he make no account of those *true* and terrible descriptions given us in Scripture of the miseries of the damned, of their rolling day and night incessantly in a lake of fire and brimstone, of their being tormented with the worm that never dieth, and with the flames of that fire which, during their continuance in those regions of misery and wretchedness, will never be quenched? Expressions which, though they are but *metaphorical*, are yet *doctrinal*, and well calculated to give the *unrepenting* sinner a just idea of the *intenseness* of those torments, which will most assuredly be his portion in an after state. Should he therefore think it any advantage to him to be released from the horrid apprehension of *eternal* punishments to come, let him know that notwithstanding *that*, the incensed God, whom he dares to disobey, will in just vindication of his injured honour and authority, amply revenge himself on his iniquitous pate; that a careless neglect or wilful contempt of his kind calls and invitations to heaven and happiness will bring upon him most assuredly some dreadful effects of his displeasure in hell; and that the farther he walks on in the path of iniquity and irreligion, the nearer he approaches to the pit of destruction. Bid him tell you whether, in the first place,

Digitized by Google

he thinks the pleasures of sin for a season will compensate for the loss of those joys in heaven, which eye had not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man to conceive? Or, secondly, whether he thinks he can extract sweets enough from the former to give a relish to the bitterness of death, to allay the stings of a reproaching conscience, or damp the rage and fury of those tribulations, to which the grave will open the dismal passage?"

Further extracts might be given from this remarkable essay, but our space being exhausted the above must suffice. The reader, should it ever come in his way, will find the whole volume worthy of perusal.

W. Maude.

# CORRESPONDENCE.

## WONDERFUL FIGURES.

Dear Sir,—It has been suggested to me by a friend—whose attention I directed to them—that the following particulars, connected with certain dates, might be of interest to some of your readers (though it is probable that some of them are already acquainted with them). I, therefore, venture to send them to you.

I will only premise that they are drawn from the writings of the late Mr. Hartley Frere; and that the dates referred to are not conjectural ones, pointing to future events, but simply historical ones; and the peculiarity of them is the singular way in which, without the slightest coaxing or manipulating, they arrange themselves. The dates are the following:—

603 B.C. The received date of Nebuchadnezzar's vision of the image.
70 A.D. The destruction of Jerusalem.
622 A.D. The rising of the Mahometan power.
1798 A.D. The occupation of Rome by the first Napoleon.
1847-8 A.D. (47, according to the old style, and 48, according to modern reckoning.) The date of the great European revolution.

Now, Mr. Frere's idea was that the jubilean period of 50 was a typical period; and he points out this peculiarity of the number 50: that it is divisible into two equal square numbers of 25 [$50 = 25 + 25 = 5^2 + 5^2$]; and also into the two unequal square numbers of 49 and 1 [$50 = 49 + 1 = 7^2 + 1^2$] Now, let us multiply 50 by 49, or take 49 fifties, and we obtain the number 2450, and this divided as above, into two equal parts gives us $1225 + 1225$; or $(49 \times 25) + (49 \times 25)$; or 35 (the half of seventy) squared, plus 35 squared. And again, divided into two unequal parts, as above, gives us $49 \times 49$, or $2401 + 49 \times 1 = 2450$.

Thus we have

$$2450 = 1225 + 1225.$$

And also,

$$2450 = 2401 + 49.$$

Now, to apply this to the dates given here, we find that the period

Digitized by Google

which elapsed between 603 B.C. and 1847 A.D. is exactly 2450 years. And if we divide this period into two equal parts of 1225 years each, we are brought by this division to the year 622 A.D.—for, 603 B.C. + 622 A.D. contains exactly 1225 years; that is, the period between the great revolution of 1847-8 and Nebuchadnezzar's dream, is exactly divided in half at the date of the rise of the Mahometan power.

Further, if we take the period which elapsed between the same date, 603 B.C. and 1798 A.D., the date of the taking of Rome, we find that it gives us exactly 49 × 49 years, or 2401; and when we add to this date 49 years, we are again brought to the year 1847.

Further still, when we calculate the period which elapsed between the destruction of Jerusalem and the taking of Rome—the interval between the entire ceasing of the Jewish dispensation and, if the ideas of many be correct, the commencement of the latter days, exactly amounts to 1728 years; and 1728 is 12 × 12 × 12, the dimensions as given in the Apocalypse of the heavenly Jerusalem.

Now, whatever conclusions any one may draw from these figures, it is impossible to believe that this singular arrangement of numbers *can* be accidental.

Mr. Frere's idea was, I believe, that the revolutions of 1847-8 were, upon the earth, the symptoms and visible signs that in heaven Christ had received his crown as the King of the earth.

Allow me to add one or two suggestions of my own in connection with the above. After Christ was born into the earth, 30 years elapsed before he began his ministry, and then probably 3½ years before he finished it. Now, if Mr. Frere's interpretation be correct, and it Christ's assuming his crown be an event analogous to his birth, we are now at the end of the thirty years; and, therefore, what events may we not even now be looking for? And, further on, if we add 3½ years to this present date—1878—we are brought to the year 1881-2, which has already been marked as an epoch of remarkable significance.

Our only feeling and desire can be, may we be found *ready* and *watching*. Faithfully yours,

F. M. C.

---

## "CHRISTIANITY IN SOLUTION."

DEAR SIR,—In the correspondence of the February RAINBOW General Goodwyn joins issue with Mr. Maude upon the question of the Universal Fatherhood of God. This is not the place to go fully into the discussion: I have already attempted that upon a former occasion;* but I would like to refer to one or two of the General's remarks.

He states at the outset that Mr. Maude "asserts that God is the Father of *all* men . . . . not as his offspring by Creation only, but in the highest and holiest sense of the relationship," and then refers to pp. 28-30 RAINBOW for January. I have read the article carefully, and do not find this "highest and holiest" sense upheld indiscriminately, and would like to know the particular passage that supports such a view. The General then asks, with reference to obdurate sinners—"Now if these sinners really have the privilege of calling God 'Father' *in the above sense* during their life in the world, does

* See RAINBOW, Nov. 1876.

Digitized by Google

it not inevitably follow that God will destroy his own children at last, having lured them all their lives into a feeling of security under the shelter of an affiliation that was but imaginary after all?" I would ask whether, supposing "Love" here substituted for "Father" ("*God is Love*") it would reverse or alter the "inevitable" conclusion drawn?

Surely it is untrue to talk of God "luring his creatures into a false security." Whether we regard him as a heavenly Father or a God of love, such reasoning is based upon an imperfect and false conception of the nature and attributes of the Father, or of the God of love, neither of which relationships can for a moment tolerate or hold out any quarter to *sin*. The child may deceive himself; but not the Father the child.

General Goodwyn then proceeds to reject Mr. Maude's application of the parable of the prodigal son. Now I venture to think that no amount of casuistry—no delicate distinction between "*reconciling* love and *restoring* love," will make this unique parable the peculiar property of the "elect." Thank God, our intuition tells us this is for *universal* possession—"Dead and is alive again; lost and is found." "Far country." *That's* "alien" enough I think!

"God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son," &c. "*So*"—"*world*"—"*gave*—weighty words these in their present connection! I ask, can "Father" sustain truer, more vital, farther-reaching "moral relationships" to his creatures—his children—than that? Can anything but perfect *fatherhood* account for such dealings, or would there be any less responsibility on either side if the name were changed from *Father* into *God*? All the declarations we have of God's infinite goodness and love and *justice* beat time to the pulsations of the fatherly heart from whence they spring. God is *one*, and his fatherhood is *in* that unity. Many of his children may not know of their royal descent until linked to Him who is their "Elder Brother" and the revealer of the Father; then they become children *indeed*—not only in name but in *nature*. But to suppose that prior to this they were in any sense other than a strong figure "sons of the devil" is to attribute a parentage as absurd as would be that of "children of *wrath*"—understood literally.

That God can be the Father of saints and sinners in precisely the same sense, or have the same high and holy fellowship with each alike, neither Mr. Maude nor the present writer asserts; but that nevertheless He is as truly the Father of *all* as an earthly parent is father of bad and good children I most firmly believe the Scriptures teach. It does not argue the faintest injustice in the father that he treats one child with severity, the other with tenderness: or that he regards the one with pitying love and *wrath* if you will, and the other with the utmost complacency of affection; for *as are the children* so is the father: the child—in a true sense—makes the father. Until the universal fatherhood is believed in, Christianity must drag itself wearily along. The RAINBOW, however, is helping to lift the dark cloud that has so long obscured the sweet light of God's true character; and men will one day believe that "he is no respecter of persons," because all are alike precious to his heart.

Yours in this faith,

JAMES DOBSON.

Digitized by Google

## "CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY" AND "FAITH."

DEAR SIR,—With your permission I will reply to Mr. Minton and Mr. Hobson in one letter, the subjects of theirs, in your issue of this month, being of similar import.

To Mr. Minton, I express regret that an edition of his "Glory of Christ" of later date than 1868 did not come into my hands. The erasure of what he terms a "blot" will surely enhance the value of a work that before was excellent.

To both correspondents I say that I am content that the device on our banner, "Conditional Immortality," should remain, assured that the custody of the standard in the hands of the "good soldiers" of the divine "Captain of our salvation" is a guarantee for its unimpaired lustre, and for the maintenance of a "good fight of faith" in its behalf.

To Mr. Hobson I would specially say: firstly, that his statement as to the source of faith is not very clear. He says, "It is incorrect to speak of faith as the gift of God," and yet, that "faith in Christ is indeed the gift of God." I fail to harmonise the two sentences. He could scarcely have supposed that by faith I meant that mental operation of the *natural* man by which he believes in mundane objects and phenomena; but faith, as "the fruit of the Spirit" (Gal. v. 22); faith that "*comes* by hearing the Word of God," and receives it *because* it is the Word *of God*—an "evidence of things not seen." With regard to Ephes. ii. 8, Mr. Hobson is in a small minority in his opinion. If the "faith" there mentioned is not of God, then there results the untenable doctrine that salvation is partly of God—"by grace"—and partly of man—"through faith." This would be fatal to peace! To assert that saving faith, such as that in the above passage, is something inherent in man is to oppose the plain testimony that the Spirit of God has borne to the *helplessness* as well as the sinfulness of humanity. That which is "*dead* in sins" cannot *arouse itself* to any activity of faith and life.

But again, the words in Ephes. ii. 8 should be "through *the* faith," διὰ τῆς πίστεως; what faith, but that in Christ, that Mr. Hobson says is "the gift of God?" Certainly not the independent effort of the human will, for "the things of God" are not possible of reception by "the natural man; they are foolishness to him" (1 Cor. ii. 14). The doctrine of salvation by Jesus Christ is not presented as a problem to be solved by the reason, but as a *revelation* from God for the awakening of the conscience. Certainly, then, "*the* faith" in it is "not of ourselves, but the gift of God." Both the Lord himself, in the days of his flesh, and his Spirit afterwards, by the testimony of the apostles, have expressly referred saving faith to *the immediate gift of God.* (John vi. 65; Acts xviii. 27; Phil. i. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 7; Col. ii. 12.)

Secondly: Mr. Hobson arraigns the object of my reference to 2 Tim. iv. 1, giving a different rendering of the verse from that in our A.V., and quoting Dean Alford as authority. But Mr. Hobson has not quoted the dean correctly. His words are, "Christ Jesus, who shall one day judge the quick and the dead, and *by** (not 'of') his appearing and his kingdom." The difference is scarcely worth mentioning. But whatever may be

* So the Sinaitic version.

Digitized by Google

the correct rendering, the testimony throughout Scripture is to the fact that the judgment of the quick, or living individuals and nations, will commence at, or by, "the appearing of Jesus Christ," and that it will be in exercise during the period of "his kingdom," for "he must reign *till* he hath put all enemies under his feet" (1 Cor. xv. 25). At the close of the kingdom, "the dead," at "the resurrection of condemnation" (John v. 29), will be arraigned before the Great White Throne (Rev. xx. 11-15).

According to Ps. xcvii., "righteousness and judgment" are the very foundation on which the millennial throne of the Lord will be established (see ver. 1-5 with xcvi. 13). His apocalypse is ushered in by crushing judgment on the antichristian beast and his hosts (Rev. xix. 11-end). He then proceeds to incarcerate the devil; after which various acts of judgment on his "enemies" are recorded, from the destruction of "Gog of the land of Magog" (Ezek. xxxviii., xxxix.) to the final consumption of certain rebellious living nations after the devil is "loosed out of his prison; *when the thousand years" of the reign of the Son of man "are expired*" (Rev. xx. 7-10).

It is announced as a dire necessity that legal coercion be exercised towards certain kings, rulers, and peoples during the reign of God's King on the "holy hill of Zion;" that they be broken "with a rod of iron" (Ps. ii. with cxlix. 5-9), because they will not submit to the authority and government of the great King. This necessity is further stated in many Scriptures to be for the protection of the peaceably disposed nations, the maintenance of righteousness and peace on earth, and security for the evangelical mission of Israel.

Much more might be advanced,* but I have exceeded the limits of a correspondent. I will conclude by remarking that, as far as I know, pre-millennialists do not look for "the *general* judgment of quick and dead *at* Christ's appearing," as Mr. Hobson supposes; but to the occurrence of judicial acts of restraint during the kingdom, and the final assize of the dead at its close. The judicial character of the millennium is not, I think, sufficiently considered.

I am, faithfully yours,

H. GOODWYN.

Wellington House,
Cleveden, Somerset.

---

## Literature.

---

*Four Plain Lectures* on Man, Death, Life, and God. By the Rev. Arthur Hayne Hamilton, B. A., Rector of St. Mary Arches, Exeter. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

ON the title page of this twenty-four page pamphlet are the words: "Grounded on the Scriptural and Primitive, but forgotten doctrine of a CONDITIONAL Immortality."

In small compass, Mr. Hamilton puts much important thought in connection with the great question of the day; and though we may not see with him on all points, that is no reason why we should not heartily thank him for his testimony in favour of essential truth. Men who have the courage of their convictions are needed. May their number increase!

---

* Recorded in my recent work on The Revelation, pp. 298-311.

Digitized by Google

*The Hand-book of Bible Words:* Giving an explanation of all the prominent words, and proper names found in the Bible, with their derivation and signification. By H. F. Woolrych, M.A. With an Introduction by the Rev. J. J. S. Perowne, D D., Canon of Llandaff. London: Elliot Stock.

THE title of this book will suggest, what its contents abundantly prove, that it is a valuable help to students of the sacred records. It is a dictionary which the preacher should have on his table when preparing his sermon. Mr. Woolrych has turned his philology to good account, and we thank him for his labour. Canon Perowne's short, but graceful "Introduction" is a sufficient testimony to the usefulness of the manual.

*The End of the World Near;* or Antichrist, the Beast of Rev. xiii. By James M. Swormstedt. Cincinnati, Ohio: E. W. Swormstedt.

IF this book speaks truth, the Lord Jesus comes for his Church this year. It may be so, and there are multitudes who would wish it so. But Mr. Swormstedt fails to secure our confidence, first, because the time of the advent is not revealed; secondly, because, whilst professing to be under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, he admits his liability to err; and, thirdly, because the sensible things he says are darkened by the shadow of his unparalleled nonsense about the moon, meteors, and demons.

*The Foundations of the Mortal Resurrection Theory Examined.* By W. Laing. Edinburgh: W. Laing, 51, Buccleuch Street. 3d.

THE foundations of this absurd theory are rotten, and Mr. Laing proves it with a clearness and force which leaves nothing to be desired. There are many valuable thoughts in this pamphlet, one of the best papers that the industrious author has written.

*Life in Christ:* A Study of the Scripture Doctrine on the Nature of Man, the object of the Divine Incarnation, and the Conditions of Human Immortality. By Edward White. Third edition, revised and enlarged. London: Elliot Stock.

THIS great work has already secured for itself a high reputation, and the issue of a third and cheap edition, whilst it is a proof that the fundamental doctrine of the book is attracting universal attention, will greatly widen the circle of its influence. The hearty welcome we gave the volume on its first appearance is repeated; and we congratulate our able friend on the success of his thoughtful labour in the cause of Gospel truth against theological error.

*The British Nation.* Is it the Nation of Israel? By W. T. Ord, Darlington. London: W. H. Guest.

THERE are certain truths covered with the dust of ages which are to be brought to light at the close of this dispensation. Among the rest is the discovery of "the lost ten tribes of Israel." We are glad that increasing attention is being paid to this great matter. Our conviction that the Anglo-Saxons are Israelites is of thirty years' standing. Mr. Ord's pamphlet is a valuable contribution to the subject. His arguments are simply conclusive, and we are pleased to find that he brings forward the very argument which struck us many years ago as irresistible, namely, that the prophecies which relate to Israel

Digitized by Google

are being fulfilled by the British people, and by no other nation upon earth. But the recognition of this delightful fact, while it accounts for our marvellous history, calls upon us to remember our far-reaching and sacred responsibilities. We hope Mr. Ord's calmly thoughtful tract will be widely read; for this is one of the questions upon which at evening time it shall be light.

*The Decay of Churches: a Spiritual Outlook.* Price 3s. 6d. Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

Though our Magazine be devoted to the revealed future of the Church and the world, we are not unwilling to hear what such a writer as Mr. Henry Dunn has to say about their *un*revealed future; especially when one of his chapters has the ominous heading — "What may possibly come to pass." Well, this possible contingency is of a very sweeping character, involving nothing short of a forcible suppression by government, not only of dominant hierarchies, but of all religious organisations without exception; and this as a corrective of the disturbing influence which the leaders of such organisations may be tempted to exercise. This, with much parallel legislation to the same effect, though at first sight apparently disastrous, the author anticipates may turn out to be blessing in disguise, on the simple ground that the fate of Christianity is not involved in the fate of churches. The true prophet will be recognised as instinctively as ever; but worldly compromises, artificial fraternities, and thinking by proxy, will give place to individual manhood and greatly exalted self-sacrifice. For the point mainly insisted upon throughout the book, is that churches and fixed beliefs have strangled the spiritual life of individual believers, superseded household piety, given birth to countless schisms, jealousies, and unjust judgments, and furnished the evidence of eighteen centuries that they will never accomplish the reformation of mankind. Popular unbelief meanwhile is precipitating the crisis, and combining with corrupt action within the churches to make the approaching discussion on disestablishment one of ever augmenting perplexity. The prelatical party now in power would much more readily consent to a sweeping away of all ecclesiastical legislation than to a dropping down to the ignominious level of tolerated nonconformity. The position of their brethren in Ireland they view with lofty scorn; and we may be quite sure that no "scheme" yet ventilated among Liberationists will meet the exigencies of the trying hour.

*Churches and Modern Unbelief.* A Communication Dedicated to the Christian Evidence Society. By one of its Friends. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

The writer of this tract believes in Christ but not in Churches. He thinks with John Foster, that "all ecclesiastical organisations are useless and mischievous, and the sooner they are dissolved the better." The tract assumes the form of a critical letter on Prebendary Row's "Reasons for believing in Christianity, addressed to Busy People," and is evidently the production of a thoughtful man.

*England's High Calling.* A Pamphlet for the Times. By R. London: Poole, Paternoster Row.

The object of this small pamphlet is to show that "England is Israel." As such England has a splendid duty and a wonderful destiny.

Digitized by Google

# NOTICES.

DEATH OF HENRY DUNN, Esq.—The readers of this Magazine have often had the privilege of perusing papers written by Mr. Henry Dunn—one of the clearest-headed men we ever knew, and a pioneer in the great Doctrinal Reformation which is at present engaging the thoughts of Christians everywhere. This devout and very thoughtful man fell on sleep on the 16th of March, in his 78th year. For many years Secretary to the British and Foreign School Society, and the animating spirit of that great Institution, the cause of popular education owes him much. His ecclesiastical and biblical works are remarkable for independent thought and careful examination of Scripture. He was in no sense of the word a party man, but he recognised and loved individual Christians wherever he found them. His generous hand was ever open to do good, but he looked with high-minded contempt on that charity which must have its gifts proclaimed in newspapers. A great and good man has gone to sleep until the Lord comes. Another of our friends has left us. We commend his excellent widow, in her grief, to the loving care of our Father in heaven.

"A. B."—Yes; we are able to sympathise with the tried, and that for the best of reasons; but take this advice:—

> Safe from every danger, kept by power divine,
> On the heart that loves thee, let thy head recline;
> Be toss'd about no more, let weary wanderings end;
> He who stills the tempest is thy mighty Friend.

"H. S." (Baldock, Herts) expresses thanks for the light derived from the RAINBOW. He says: "I cannot refrain from acknowledging my gratitude to you." He also says that he was shocked beyond measure at the ferocious terms of a sermon he heard on eternal torments, and felt that the thing was "blasphemy;" and concludes with the true remark, that the doctrine of the Bible is "eternal life to the believer, and eternal death to the rejector of Christ."

"H. D."—We are obliged for your approval of "the manner in which" we "contend for, and defend some of the most important truths of Christianity." We certainly wish to serve our glorious MASTER in the Spirit that He approves. The defence of truth admits no passion but that of love. The time is short; we are trying to redeem it; and we hope the right spirit will always be manifested in doing so.

"F. C."—Right enough, so far; but surely "the Gospel" embraces more than a new heart, the Holy Spirit, and pardon. These belong to the Gospel of the grace, and are very precious; but what about the Gospel of the glory? (1 Tim. i. 11. Greek.) The supreme purpose of this Magazine is to teach that the return of the Lord is the *only hope* of Church and world. In every number *that* is taught. Many years before the issue of the RAINBOW, we proclaimed the same glorious truth by voice and pen. It is emphatically our *Testimony*, and we will not keep silence about it.

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

JUNE, 1878.

## THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

WHAT the key-stone is to the arch, or the foundation to the building, is the resurrection of the Christ to the faith and hope of the Christian. This truth is strikingly told by the apostle in 1 Cor. xv. 11-18, "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain; and ye are yet in your sins; and they also who have fallen asleep in Christ are perished." These consequences of an unrisen Christ are so plain that illustration or argument is unnecessary. Every one who trusts in the Lord Jesus Christ for his own eternal salvation and the salvation of the world; every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ must, of necessity, be first assured that he died on the cross, was buried, and rose again, to die no more.

It is well, then, to have our minds familiarised with the proof of our Lord's resurrection, that we may be able to "give a reason for the hope that is in us;" and assure and confirm others who may be turning to the Lord. The resurrection of Jesus is indeed an extraordinary event, and therefore requires strong evidence. It is, however, possible. I know that many in our day affirm that no amount of evidence can establish it. Yet I have no hesitation in appealing to all who have faith in the living and Almighty God, whether it is a thing incredible that he should raise the dead? But, admitting the possibility of the event, we may still legitimately ask for its evidence. To that I now call attention.

I. And, first, we point to the empty grave. The dead Christ had been buried. The tomb was a cave, hewn out of the solid rock: there Jesus was laid; the entrance was made secure, and a guard of soldiers set to watch it. We are familiar with the reason for such precautions: "The next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came to Pilate, and said: Sir, we remember that this deceiver said, while he was yet



Digitized by Google

alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead; so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate answered, You have a watch; go your way, make it as sure as you can. So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch." (Matt. xxvii. 62-66.) We may be sure that these men would make certain that the crucified Jesus was really in the tomb, and that there was no way of entrance or exit, except by the door, which they secured in the manner already described. Yet, on the morning of the third day, the first day of the week, the tomb was empty! How is this to be accounted for? Only two solutions present themselves. 1, That the Scripture narrative is true; or, 2, That the friends of Jesus had removed him by stealth. This latter plea was indeed set up by the elders and chief priests, when they heard from the terrified soldiers their account of the events of the morning. "They gave large money to the soldiers, saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night and stole him away while we slept; and if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and secure you." But what a vain pretext! How could the disciples possibly do such a thing? A Roman guard was commonly composed of sixty men. Even though on this occasion it had been less, how can we conceive of the few weak, timid, and unarmed disciples of Jesus attempting to force an entrance to the sepulchre, and carry the dead body of their Master away through that body of armed men?

But if the soldiers slept? A very unlikely thing indeed that any of them should sleep while on guard, much more so that the whole should. Again, how were the disciples to suppose that the guard would all be so drowsy as to fall asleep at the peril of their lives? Besides, if the guard really slept, how could they tell that it was the disciples that had taken away the body of Jesus? The story is self-evidently false. It cannot be believed.

How then is the empty tomb to be accounted for? The Scripture narrative explains it: "Behold, there was a great earthquake; for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow; and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men." (Matt. xxviii. 2-4.) The world's Redeemer walked forth from the grave, alive for evermore, and having the keys of death and the grave.

II. In proof of the resurrection of Christ we point to the testimony of those who saw him after he had risen. This is the only kind of evidence that can reasonably be asked for in the circumstances—the testimony of eye-witnesses. Such evidence is afforded. Men who had been the companions of Jesus while alive, declared that they saw him, touched him, heard him speak

Digitized by Google

to them, and ate and drank with them after he had risen from the grave.

Let us test the credibility of these witnesses.

1. Were they under a delusion? The circumstances forbid this. For,

(*a.*) They did not expect to see Jesus alive again. Notwithstanding the fact that he had foretold his death and resurrection, and that his enemies understood and remembered his words, yet his disciples remained oblivious of his prediction, and evinced remarkable incredulity. Witness the sorrow of those two on their way to Emmaus as they "walk and are sad." "We trusted it had been he which should have redeemed Israel; and beside all this, to day is the third day since these things were done," &c. (Luke xxiv. 17-24.)

So far were their minds from being prepared by expectancy for hallucination or delusion as to the appearance of their Master after his burial, the report of his appearance to some was esteemed as idle tales; and one of them was so incredulous that he declared: "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe." (John xx. 25.)

Even Mary Magdalene, to whom he first appeared, had no idea that her beloved Master would come forth alive from the tomb, or why did she, along with the other Mary, buy sweet spices that she might come and anoint him? So far, indeed, was such expectancy from her mind, that when she saw him she did not know who it was, till she heard the familiar and tender tones of voice saying, "Mary!" a circumstance which quite agrees with the facts, as narrated, but quite at variance with the theory of illusion founded on expectancy. It was very early in the morning, while it was yet dark, just at the dawning of the day, that Mary came to the sepulchre. She had been weeping, for she supposed some one had taken away her Lord, and she knew not where to find him. Moreover, the countenance of Jesus, radiant with immortal life, must have been very different from what it was when she last looked on it. All this fully accounts for Mary not recognising her Lord until she heard his voice. "The visage alters with years and health, but the tone of voice outlives the external signs of identity." But had she been on the outlook for a living friend that morning, as his predictions might have warranted, she could not have failed to know him at once.

But again, the disciples said they had seen Jesus after his burial, at different times, and in different circumstances; and the witnesses were many (see 1 Cor. xv. 5-8); in one instance five hundred brethren saw him at once. Add to this the circumstance thahe had appeared among them for forty days, and spoken to them concerning the kingdom of God; and that in open day the eleven, while in the act of conversing with him, had seen him ascend from



Digitized by Google

Mount Olivet, in a cloud towards heaven, and say, Is it possible they could fancy all that?

2. Shall we then declare the apostles impostors? This supposition is utterly incredible. They delivered their testimony in Jerusalem—the place where the event happened—not in some far off city of the Roman Empire. While the crucifixion of Jesus was yet fresh in the memory of the people, Peter stood forth in a public place, and to an assembled multitude spoke these words:—"Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are witnesses." (Acts ii. 22-24, 32.)

It has been well remarked, that if the resurrection of Jesus was not a reality "the apostles were insane to defy the authorities, who, they must have been aware, had a host of facts wherewith to annihilate their pretensions. For what did they ordain a watch at the tomb? Was it not to meet such an emergency as this? And now was their time. Let them bring forward the Roman guard to declare that the seal was never broken; let them exhibit the remains of Jesus, and in one hour Peter and his confederates are overwhelmed in disgrace. But in lieu of evidence to shield the populace from deception, instead of saving their flock out of regard for their fleece at any rate, they fulminate against the speakers; and while the witnesses are sublimely heroic, the higher powers skulk into retirement, and are agued with fear." "These men persisted to the last, and holy, self-denying men they were, in their undaunted and harmonious protestations that the Hope of the world had returned a conqueror from Hades; with probably only one exception they sealed their testimony with their blood.

"Be it observed, it was not an opinion they died for; they were martyrs primarily to a fact—the resurrection of their Lord. Men may resign their breath in defence of conjectures, . . . but their martyrdom in such cases is logically no more than a demonstration of the sincerity and intensity of their opinions; . . . but when a company of excellent men submit to a death of agony rather than revoke what their eyes have seen, and their ears have heard, and their hands handled, we have not merely the utmost evidence of sincerity, but the highest conceivable reason based on human testimony to esteem their affirmations eternal verities."*

* The Death and Resurrection of Christ. A Lecture by William Glen Moncrieff. Delivered before the Young Men's Christian Society, London, Ontario.

Digitized by Google

"There was here," remarks an eloquent writer, "as to that fact of resurrection, no room for mistake. It was a fact, or it was a falsehood. Peter, James, the twelve, the five hundred, all said they had seen the Lord; that he spoke with them, ate with them, showed them his hands and his side, had been at pains to prove to them that it was no shadowy form of their own imaginations—that it was his true and real self, emerged from Joseph's sepulchre, that they looked upon. Either all that was true, or they were wilful, intentional deceivers, trying to palm a falsehood upon the world."*

What conceivable reason could the apostles have had for their conduct, had their testimony been false? The whole world was against them. Scorn, contumely, stripes, imprisonment, and death the only reward that awaited them. That intelligent men should act as they did in behalf of a lie, is infinitely more incredible than the testimony they bore.

Dr. Hannah well refers to the attitude of one notable witness of the truth of Christ's resurrection, after twenty years' testimony had been publicly borne to that wonderful and important event, viz., the Apostle Paul. In 1 Cor. xv. 15 he boldly stakes his character and the character of his fellow apostles on the reality of Christ's resurrection. These are his words: "Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not." What but the consciousness of truth could have led a man like Paul to take such a position in the circumstances? "Twenty years had passed since the alleged event had happened. Twenty years had sifted that testimony, had searched it more thoroughly than the most rigorous cross-examination of the court-house. The witnesses were numerous enough, scattered enough, independent enough to have brought out any inconsistency, to have detected any attempted collusion."

"Is there not something in the very manner of Paul's speech, here, that tells us how monstrous to himself, and surely as incredible to others, the very supposition seemed? So far as it is, or can be, a mere matter of human testimony, we would be willing to peril the whole fate of Christianity upon the evidence of that one witness—Paul,—that whole evidence as it lies before us—in these letters of his—written at different times, from different places, in different circumstances, to different persons—so frank, so full, so overflowing—the whole thought, the whole heart of the man so unrestrainedly poured forth. Read these letters and say, Is it possible that you could have got a man more thoroughly qualified by his intelligence, clear sightedness, and early acquaintance both with Jewish and Gentile faiths, to decide upon the matter—his birth, his education, his earthly prospects all tending to create a bias against, and not in favour of the new faith? How are you to

* The Resurrection of the Dead. By Dr. Hannah.

Digitized by Google

account for it, that there upon the spot—there within so short a time after the crucifixion of our Lord—there with every means lying open to him to examine into the truth of all the facts and miracles of our Lord's history, such a man became a convert to Christianity? We have his own account of his conversion; an account which, if we accept as true, determines the whole matter. But even setting that aside, look at the after life and labours, toilings and sufferings of this man, crowned at last with the martyr's death. How are we to account for them in any other supposition than that of the truth of Christianity?"

Again, the credibility of the apostles is confirmed by the fact that their testimony was believed by thousands of their contemporaries. Christianity is no product of the superstition of the middle ages; but has existed from the date of its own era. How could it have been believed then, unless evidence of its truth had been given? "We are told," says Mr. Dobney in his "Letters to the Perplexed,"* "that such an alleged event as the resurrection [of Christ] is inadmissible, because unhistorical. We ask, in some wonder, How unhistorical, since history herself dates her annals B.C. or A.C.?" And the answer, as if studiously prepared for the purpose, is, that an event cannot be at once historical and supernatural, for history is only possible on the presupposition of the absolute continuity and homogeneity of experience; nothing enters the realm of history [as *constituted by me*, criticism] save through the gates of nature." But this is the very negation history proves to be false. The province of history is to narrate matters of fact; and a fact that has only happened once is as much historical as though it had occurred a thousand times. The reason *à priori* as to what can be historical seems fallacious and unphilosophical. In spite of such dictum we appeal to the fact that Christianity has existed from the date of its fundamental fact, the resurrection of Christ.

"Here is Christendom," writes Mr. Dobney. "As you trace a river to its source, so can we trace Christianity and the Church back to the first age. No one disputes that within twenty or twenty-five years after Jesus of Nazareth had been put to death as a malefactor, dying on the slave's cross, there were little communities formed, not only throughout Judea and Samaria, but in all the great centres of civilisation and commerce throughout the Roman Empire. We know something of these Roman writers; for, from the circumstances of the case, the Roman authorities had soon to take cognisance of them. Making allowance for the contemptuous feelings with which a Roman noble or gentleman would inevitably regard a set of 'low' mechanics and others, who had presumed to throw off their allegiance to their country's gods, and dared to adopt '*a religio illicita*,' we gather that these followers of 'one

* *Christian World.*

Digitized by Google

Christus,' whom Pontius Pilatus had scourged and crucified, were harmless in their lives, and blameless in character, except for their culpable 'obstinacy' in refusing, even under peril of being thrown to the lions, to burn incense to the gods. We learn that they used to sing hymns to Christ as God, and pledge one another to abstain from all forms of evil, and to do good. These communities spread in spite of sometimes severe persecution, till the heathen temples began to be deserted, and complaints arose that 'religion' was endangered. Long before [the end of] the first century after the death of Christ, Christians and Christianity were everywhere known."

It was known thus widely then, but it must have been in existence before; and as its date of commencement was known, its history could be easily traced back to its source. That source is the alleged fact of the resurrection of the crucified Jesus, borne witness to in the manner already described. From all this it follows as demonstrably as the ordinary laws of evidence can reasonably demand, that the belief that Jesus died and rose again, and was seen alive by these witnesses, has existed since the date of his resurrection. How possibly, in the circumstances, could it be introduced at any subsequent period? Thus we have found the resurrection of Jesus demonstrated by the fact of his empty grave, the testimony of eye-witnesses who were well-acquainted with him, who at various times and different places saw him, spoke to him, ate and drank with him, and received instruction from him during a period of forty days after his resurrection,—witnesses whose credibility is established by the severest tests, and whose testimony carried such evidence with it that on the very spot where the events transpired, thousands of persons, formerly hostile, believed, and confessed it, and, though the witnesses were destitute of rank and wealth who gave their testimony to the fact that God had raised up the crucified Jesus from the dead, their adherents existed and increased throughout the Roman Empire, and have existed in one continual line from the date of the resurrection till the present hour.

Finally, we point to the monument of the Lord's Supper. The object of that ordinance is for a remembrance of Christ; but its origin and essential nature are founded on his death and resurrection. As often as we do this we show forth his death till he come. While we in this ordinance "show forth" the death of the Christ, it is the death of one who was dead and is alive for evermore; but for that its celebration would be indeed a sad and hopeless ceremony; and its observance would, in all probability, have long ere now ceased. It is the idea that he, whose memory is cherished, is alive and for ever beyond the dominion of death, that inspires his followers lovingly and hopefully to show forth his death till he come. The fact, therefore, that he who was crucified by Pontius Pilate and buried in Joseph's tomb, rose from the dead on the third day afterwards, lies at the heart of this institution; and

Digitized by Google

from the nature of the case the rite must have been observed from the first.

The essential importance of the resurrection of our Lord was alluded to in our introductory remarks. The Apostle Paul stakes the whole truth of Christianity on this one fact; and the reason will appear when we consider what it involves.

The resurrection of Jesus declares :—

1. That he is the Son of the living God. In his public teaching he often affirmed this, and the hostile Jews charged him with blasphemy in consequence. When before their council, the elders, chief priests, and scribes asked him, "Art thou then the Son of God?" he avowed that he was. Had he not been what he professed to be, God would not have raised him from the dead; therefore the Apostle Paul points to that resurrection as the proof whereby Jesus Christ our Lord, of the seed of David, according to the flesh, was declared to be the Son of God with power. (Rom. i. 3, 4.)

2. That he is the Messiah, the promised King of Israel and of all nations, the Holy One whom God did not suffer to see corruption. "Therefore," cried the Apostle Peter, in presence of the multitude, "let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ." (Acts ii. 22-36.) And so also the Apostle Paul, in presence of the wise men of Greece, "God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead." (Acts xvii. 31.)

3. That he is Lord both of the dead and of the living. We have already seen that Peter pointed to the fact of Christ's resurrection as assuring evidence that God had made Jesus both Lord and Christ. Not only King, but also Proprietor of all. By his lineal descent and the appointment of God he was heir to the throne of David, to which all the world is to be subject. He has, moreover, bought the inheritance with his own blood; and came forth from the grave a conqueror over death, to die no more. The purpose of God in all this was that his beloved Son might be rightly fitted and constituted Lord of all. "For, to this end Christ both died and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living." (Rom. xiv. 9.)

"For his obedience unto death God hath given him a name above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord—to the glory of God the Father." (Phil. ii. 9-11.)

4. That his sacrifice for our sins was accepted: he died for our sins and rose again for our justification. Therefore he has gone into heaven with his own blood, and ever liveth to make intercession for us. "If when we were enemies we were reconciled to God

Digitized by Google

by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life."

5. That he is the Resurrection and the Life. He died and rose, not simply as an individual. He was a "representative man," the Second Adam, the Lord from heaven. "As by man came death, even so by man came the resurrection of the dead." "I am he," said he to his servant John, "that liveth and was dead, and, behold, I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of hades and of death." (Rev. i. 18.)

"Christ is risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that sleep." "Come, see the place where the Lord lay!" As Jesus died and rose again, even so those who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him."

W. LAING.

Edinburgh.

---

## DAVID'S TRAINING.

WHY were such oceans of feeling poured unto David's soul, such true and graceful utterance of poetry infused into his lips, and such skill of music seated in his right hand! Such oceans of feeling did God infuse into his soul, and such utterance of poetry he placed between his lips, and such skilful music he seated in his right hand, in order that he might conceive forms of feeling for all saints, and create an everlasting psalmody, and hand down an organ for expressing the melody of the renewed soul. The Lord did not intend that his Church should be without a rule for uttering its gladness and its glory, its lamentation and its grief; and to bring such a rule and institute into being, he raised up his servant David, as formerly he raised up Moses to give to the Church an institute of Law. And to that end he led him the round of all human conditions, that he might catch the spirit proper to every one, and utter it according to truth; he allowed him not to curtail his being by treading the round of one function, but by every variety of functions he cultivated his whole being, and filled his soul with wisdom and feeling. He found him objects for every affection, that the affection might not slumber and die. He brought him up in the sheep-pastures, that the groundwork of his character might be laid amongst the simple and universal forms of feeling. He took him to the camp, and made him a conqueror, that he might be filled with nobleness of soul and ideas of glory. He placed him in the palace, that he might be filled with ideas of majesty and sovereign might. He carried him to the wilderness, and placed him in solitudes, that his soul might dwell alone in the sublime conceptions of God and his mighty works; and he kept him there for long years, with only one step between him and death, that he might be well schooled to trust and depend upon

Digitized by Google

the Providence of God. And in none of these various conditions and avocations of life did he take away from him his Holy Spirit. His trials were but the tuning of the instrument with which the Spirit might express the various melodies which he designed to utter by him for the consolation and edification of spiritual men. John the Baptist, being to be used for rough work, was trained in the rough desert; Paul, being to be used for contentions and learned work, was trained at Gamaliel's feet; Daniel, being to be used for judgment and revelation, was trained in the wisdom of the East; Joseph being to be used as a providence to Egypt and his father's house, was trained in the hardest school of providence; and every one hath been disciplined by the providence of God, as well as furnished in the fountains of his being for that particular work for which the Spirit of God designed him. Therefore, David had that brilliant galaxy of natural gifts, that rich and varied education, in order to fit him for executing the high office to which he was called by the Spirit, of giving to the church those universal forms of spiritual feeling, whereof we have been endeavouring to set forth the excellent applications. And, though we neither excuse his acts of wickedness, nor impute them to the temptation of God, who cannot be tempted of evil, neither tempteth any man, we will also add that by his loss the church hath gained, and that out of the evil of his ways much good hath been made to arise; and that if he had not passed through every valley of humiliation, and stumbled upon the dark mountains, we should not have had a language for the souls of the penitent, or an expression for the dark troubles which compass the soul that feareth to be deserted by its God. So much for the fitness of the psalmist to have been made the organ of spiritual feeling unto the church.

EDWARD IRVING.

---

# "THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY COME TO PASS."

REVELATION i. 1.

No. V.

*(Continued from April.)*

IT will thus be seen that we have been careful not to interpose any event between the faith of the believer and the coming of his Lord. For it seems to us that if our Lord in going away had said "I will come again, but before I come I will send workmen to set the house in order and prepare the household for my reception," we should have watched for the coming of the men rather than the Master—precisely that which is done by those who look for millennial blessedness *before* his coming. But when we consider the terms employed to set forth the order and character of his coming,

Digitized by Google

we find them to be *these*, "suddenly, at unawares, as a thief, as lightning, as in the days that were before the flood, as it was in the days of Lot, in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh." Nevertheless, while none of the wicked shall understand —and many of the righteous, too, we fear shall not understand—the wise shall understand and so be found in readiness. And Paul to the Thessalonians said: "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief, for yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." And so it shall come to pass that those in whom grace is found reigning; those whose hearts to the inquiry, "Lovest thou me more than these?" would respond, "Yea, Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I *affectionately* love thee. (See Emphatic Diaglott.) My chief trouble is, I cannot love thee as I would;" these, such as these, all these, whatever their estimate of themselves may be—and many that are last in their own esteem, are first in His—shall enter in with him to the marriage ere the door is shut. For they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that age* and *the* resurrection from the dead are those who shall be accounted *so* by him, and the raised and changed ones shall in their change receive the seal of his approbation. Then and not till then shall we return and discern between the approved and the rejected, between him that serveth God, and him that serveth him not. It shall not be our own estimate of ourselves, but his estimate of us that shall determine readiness and unreadiness in that day. All mistakes about ourselves, and one another shall in the light of his presence become corrected, and many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first. They who receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life, in union with one Jesus Christ.

But now we come to consider the sign or wonder seen by John in Patmos as recorded in Rev. xii. And before entering upon the mysteries contained in this portion of God's Word we wish it to be understood that it forms no part of our design to attempt their solution in detail, but only to trace to the extent of our ability somewhat of the *order* of their fulfilment. We will only then and briefly as possible give expression to our thought, that the attempts of the commentators to show that the opening of the seals, the sounding of the trumpets, and the utterance of the woes, have had their fulfilment in the political changes of the past, is at best feeble, indefinite, uncertain, and therefore unsatisfactory. Whether the scene described in Rev. iv. has ever been witnessed otherwise than in vision is to us very questionable, certainly not in *all* its details, if we think correctly that the four and twenty elders are of all choice ones the choicest from among *the redeemed*, as Rev. v. 8, 9 satisfies us that they are. We know that by some these are thought to be angels of high order, but not by us, and if we are correct, it is certain their seats cannot be filled until after resurrection. And we delight in the anticipation of seeing among these Enoch, Noah,

Digitized by Google

Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Samuel, David, Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, if no more, of the Old Testament times; and of the New—Peter, James, John, and Paul, and possibly Wycliffe, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, of modern times, the Two Witnesses of the future who may be yet unborn, and who shall say how many illustrious names which have never adorned the page of history!—their contemporaries having failed to appreciate their worth. Nor do we confine our thought to the number of twenty-four in a book of symbols such as this; possibly the number may be twice or thrice twenty-four. What we understand by the symbols here employed is that round about the throne were seats for those of our race in whom most of the spirit of the living God had been, those in whose flesh the most of God had been manifested while they were among men. If then our thought concerning these be correct, the vision recorded in Rev. iv. cannot be realised until after resurrection, so *then* the taking of the book out of the right hand of him that sitteth on the throne, and the opening of its seals with all that follows upon the opening of those seals *must be yet future.*

We would fain linger in contemplation of this scene, so august, so sublime; for although the ground be holy, too holy to be trodden with shoes of fancy or speculation, it is attractive to love tempered with holy fear, and we would vie with the cherubim in veiling our faces while we think rather than gaze on him who "sat upon the throne, to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone," with "a book in his right hand, written within and on the back side, sealed with seven seals." Another is also here; a Lamb as it had been slain, who came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne, who also after that he had taken the book received divine honour and worship from the four living ones and the four and twenty elders. What a reproof does this contain for those who fail to honour the Son equally with the Father! Similar distinction of personality we see in the vision recorded in Dan. vii., where "the Ancient of Days did sit, and one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him," whereof more hereafter.

Yet one more preliminary to our subject in Revelation xii. The mystic period, *seven* times noted in the scripture of truth, twice in Daniel, and five times in the Revelation, severally expressed as twelve hundred and sixty days, forty and two months, a time, times, and an half, a time and times and the dividing of time, which all commentators agree as signifying three years and a half. He whose work is perfect, and who is working out his plan as one perfect whole from the beginning to the end thereof, has used largely this perfect number seven, and when at length we are able to view the whole scope of revealed truth an accomplished fact, we expect to find that the number seven has figured still more largely than we can at present comprehend. In seven days the Creator wrought and rested from his labour. (Ex. xx. 11.) Moses com-

Digitized by Google

manded Israel to observe the seventh month by a feast of seven days from the fifteenth day of the month. (Lev. xxiii. 39.) The seventh year was to be a sabbath of rest unto the field and the vineyard, that which grew of its own accord was not to be gathered. (Lev. xxv. 4.) After seven times seven years the year of jubilee was to free all bonds. (Lev. xxv. 10.) The allegorical book of Revelation is replete with sevens. And in seven thousand years from creation we doubt not the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up, the page of its history being complete, if our reading of revealed truth be correct. Most notable of all, however, is the *week of witness*, the mystic week of years, half of which was fulfilled in our Lord's three years and a half ministry; leaving the other half *to be* fulfilled in the testimony of the Two Witnesses during the period called a thousand two hundred and threescore days upon which we propose now to treat, the tribulation the great one, that hour of temptation which shall come on all the world to try them that dwell upon the earth.

We now turn to Rev. xii., where John records his vision of a great wonder (or sign) in heaven, "a woman clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." This we take to be the church in her ordained position, where God has placed her in the purpose of his grace, and where she is, to that degree wherein she is right Godward; clothed with light, that she may be "the light of the world." (Matt. v. 14.) "All children of the light, and children of the day." (1 Thess. v. 5.) And with "the moon under her feet," all sublunary things are beneath her too, showing the exalted position she is ordained of God to hold in relation to earth and earthly things; in the world, but not of it; among men, but shining as lights; a reproof upon the world's darkness, like to her Lord, holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. And the better to identify her as the church, we find her crowned with twelve stars as the twelve apostles of the Lamb. But further, John saw her "travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered," and that in the presence of a monster enemy waiting "to devour her child as soon as it was born; and she brought forth a man-child which was to rule all nations with a rod of iron, and her child was caught up unto God and his throne." From all which, we learn, that ere the rapture takes place, a time of great extremity shall have come, and just when the church appears exposed to some sweeping calamity, threatening wholesale destruction to the cause of truth in the earth, the moment will arrive wherein the waiting ones shall be caught away to meet their Lord who *to the moment* shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, heard by them only for whom it is designed—their enemies being left in wonderment what has become of their prey. In the church thus caught away, we see the man-child caught up unto God and his throne, the church of the first-born, the first-fruits unto God and the Lamb, the kind of first-fruits of his crea-

Digitized by Google

tures, the overcomers to whom he hath promised power over the nations to rule them with a rod of iron, evidently by sharing the throne with Him to whom the Father hath promised, "I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." (Psalm i. 8, 9.)

But now another, and surely a greater wonder appears to John. There was *war* in heaven. This heaven we understand to be the first heaven, the air, the atmosphere that surrounds the earth, the region into which the saints have been caught away, where evidently good and evil angels encounter each other, not for intercourse, but it would seem for contention. And here a surprise meets us, about which we can only ask suggestively: Can it be that the Prince of the power of the air, finding his prey has escaped his power on earth, now opposes them in their course through the air to meet their Lord, but under a convoy of the innumerable host of elect angels under the generalship of Michael they are safe? For we find it expressly said, "Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels," and we note that it was a *dragon* that stood before the woman to devour her child on earth, and a *dragon* fighting in heaven, whether two dragons or not, we are not concerned to inquire—the power and inspiration of evil is *one*. But this we also note, that, "they prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven." What mode of attack and defence angels can have is beyond our finite minds to comprehend, but that they can fight and do—after some sort—is too plainly revealed to be called in question by any truly devout mind. Neither is this a solitary instance on the inspired page of the contention of angels, we find it also in Daniel x. 13, 20, 21, and Jude 9. Nor is this a new feature of bold presumption in Satan to endeavour to devour the child as soon as it was born—the devourer that he is. Did he not his best to devour the righteous seed as soon as it was born in the person of Abel? And again, in the person of Joseph, "Let us slay him, and cast him into some pit, and we shall see what will become of his dreams." And again, in the person of Moses, for whose sake he slew all the male children of the Hebrew race for a while. And again, in the person of the Babe born in Bethlehem. At what a cost to the mothers of Bethlehem was the Messiah born there! Could it be that the Arch-fiend had prescience sufficient to know what deliverers these three were born to be, that his malice was so directed towards their destruction? Such questions may be asked but cannot be answered. How little we know of Satan's capacity to defy, while he cannot defeat heaven's high decrees!

Again, we observe that the result of Michael's victory and the dragon's defeat is, that this power of evil is cast down into the earth,

Digitized by Google

for we read—and let any who doubt the personality of Satan, note the wording of this passage: "The great dragon was cast out, that old Serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world, he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. Woe to the inhabiters of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." Here we have a hint of his prescience. Now begins the great tribulation, the tribulation, the great one (see Alford, Rev. vii. 14), called by Daniel "a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time," (Dan. xii. 1,) and by our Lord, "great tribulation such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be" (Matt. xxiv. 21), reaching on from the period of the rapture and first resurrection to the time that "the Lord shall go forth and fight against those nations that shall have come up against Jerusalem to battle; and his feet shall stand upon the Mount of Olives;" the point of our earth that he latest left he shall earliest reach. (Compare Zech. xiv. 4, with Acts i. 9, 12.) When thus Satan shall have been cast out into the earth, and he shall have but one territory in which to operate, and for which to care, he shall concentrate his power upon earth, and proceed to bring forth his man, called by Daniel, "a vile person;" by Paul, "that Man of Sin, the son of perdition, the Lawless One" (see Alford, 2 Thess. ii. 8), and by John, "a wild beast." (See Alford, Rev. xii. 2.) God has taken his man up into heaven, Satan will now have his man upon the earth. God incarnate has gone up. Satan having come down, shall become incarnate in a sense, and to a degree never hitherto seen, and shall exercise the astonishing power of giving life, i.e. breath, to an image, "that the image should both speak and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed" (Rev. xiii. 15), whatever that may mean. How much of fact and how much of figure we have here, the day must declare, but certain it is that "all the world shall wonder after the beast whose names are not written in the book of life." He who hath hitherto let—the Holy Ghost in the church militant—is now taken out of the way by the *rapture* of the church militant, and then shall that Wicked be revealed. (See 2 Thess. ii. 7, 8.) Hitherto there has been a withholding "that he might be revealed in his time," but now the apostasy has come, and "that Man of Sin must be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God showing himself that he is God. Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved." By this time the Gospel day has run its course, many have heard and learned of the Father

Digitized by Google

and come to Christ, the longsuffering of God has waited as in the days of Noah, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But many have neglected the great salvation, have rejected the counsel of God against themselves, in the brilliant light and teaching of the Gospel in the latter half of this nineteenth century, men of science and culture have decided for themselves, and would fain teach others that "God is matter, and matter is God," and that the "survival of the fittest" is man evolved from—they know not what, thus making God, the Bible, and its chief author Moses only so many myths. "For *this* cause doth God send them the working of delusion, that they should believe *the* falsehood—the Lawless One—that they all of them may by judged who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." (2 Thess. ii. 11, 12, Alford.)

Hackney. N. STARKEY.

(*To be continued.*)

---

# CANON GARBETT ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

## III.

(*Continued from page* 178.)

4. THERE is some further argumentation (at p. 845) which we must notice separately on the subject of the death sentence pronounced on our first parents. A certain view of this subject is taken by the able author of "Life in Christ." Canon Garbett disapproves of it, and puts forward another. But he seems to forget, or ignore, the fact that many Traditionalists have taken Mr. White's view, and that some Conditionalists have taken his—Canon Garbett's—view of that passage of Scripture. Certainly it is quite open to them to do so, so far as their Conditionalism is concerned.

It is not only Gen. ii. 7, but also Eph. ii. 1, Rev. iii. 1, that Mr. White and others* understand in the *proleptic* sense that Canon Garbett objects to so strongly. His language is strong indeed:—"The interpretation which Conditionalists are compelled to put upon such expressions" (as Eph. ii. 1, Rev. iii. 1) "is forced and unnatural to the last degree, and proves the viciousness of the system of thought which compels it. They say that the word 'dead' means those who would have died hereafter, that is, have ceased to be, if Christ had not conferred immortality upon them. 'The unregenerate men are described as the *dead*, as the *dead in sins*, because they are *certain to die*† (*sic*), because they are under

---

* The eminent commentator, Dr. Meyer, for instance, who takes that view of Eph. ii. 1. He is a host in himself, even though Ellicott and Alford differ with him.

† "Certo morituri" is Dr. Meyer's expression, with "proleptic reference to physical death," see Ellicott on Eph. ii. 1.

Digitized by Google

sentence of destruction as men of mere *soul*'" (Life in Christ, p. 306). C.O., p. 843. And so (p. 845) concerning Gen. ii. 17, "The author of *Life in Christ* says that the sentence was not executed;" i.e., in the day they sinned: "St. Paul appears." to Canon Garbett, certainly not to us, "to have been of a different opinion: 'As by one man sin came into the world, and death by sin.'"*

As this whole question is interesting in itself, and as Canon Garbett writes so strongly, and we must say so unfairly, about it, we shall best answer him by showing how the matter stands in the following words of Professor Hudson:—

"It is urged, both by the orthodox," i.e., the Traditionalists, "and by Universalists, that literal death could not have been intended in the sentence in Gen. ii. 17, because our first parents did not actually die on the day of their sin. It is inferred that the death intended was a moral or spiritual death, commonly called death 'in trespasses and sins;' and to support this view the expressions in Eph. ii. 1-5, Col. ii. 3, Matt. viii. 22 ('let the dead bury their dead), 1 Tim. v. 6 ('is dead while she liveth"), Rev. iii. 1 ('thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead'), and some others are frequently cited. And the apparently metaphorical sense of the word in such passages gives a very respectable appearance of argument to show that the threatened penalty of sin is a death which does not kill.

"But I think the argument is only apparent. True, as Adam did not die out on the day he sinned, there must be some figure or trope in the sentence; but it may still be a trope that leaves the literal sense intact. There is just such a figure in frequent use in the Bible and in the common speech of men. Thus, if a person has taken active or subtle poison, by which, sooner or later, he must die, or has provoked a mortal enemy, or has committed a capital crime, for which he must be detected and sentenced, or is falling from a precipice and must be fatally hurt, if not dashed in pieces,—we say, 'he is a dead man.' And the *time* of his dying, whether instant or after long years, makes no difference in the import and truth of the expression. The literal sense, of course, remains. This figure—of the anticipation of the future as if present—is well known among the rhetoricians, who have bestowed upon it the classic

* The late Dr. Candlish, in his "Examination of Mr. Maurice's Theological Essays," p. 467, uses just such language as Canon Garbett so unwisely reprobates with such strength of diction when used by Mr. White. With evident reference to Gen. ii. 17, he speaks of "the suspension of a judicial sentence lying upon all men for their sins. It is a suspension granted in order that there may be a proclamation of mercy to all; emphatic warning being at the same time given, that if the message is not believed, the sentence must continue in force, with all the aggravation of guilt which a refusal of grace implies. These considerations necessarily point to a time when God is to change his method of government over men individually, and over the race. For the present, viewing it broadly, it is a government of suspended judgment and offered mercy. *Sentence is not executed*"—the very words Canon Garbett objects to in Mr. White's teaching; the italics are ours—"because a ministry of grace is going forward, But this very circumstance implies that in some future day the government is to take again the judicial form and character, and men are to receive according to their deeds, either good or evil." Dr. Candlish was not a Conditionalist when he wrote those words, which however exactly suit our position, and which we endorse as true, recommending them to Canon Garbett's notice and acceptance.



Digitized by Google

name of *prolepsis*. I said it occurs in the Bible. The Egyptians applied it to themselves when the angel of death had smitten their first-born: 'We be all dead men.' And so the Israelites, when the troop of Korah was suddenly destroyed: 'Behold, we die: we perish; we all perish.' And God himself is represented as speaking in the same way to Abimelech: 'Behold, thou art but a dead man, for the woman which thou hast taken.'

"And language very similar to that in Gen. ii. 17 occurs in two similar passages. In Exodus x. 28 Pharaoh says to Moses: 'Get thee from me; take heed to thyself; see my face no more; for in the day thou seest my face thou shalt die.' Would any one have questioned the veracity of the king if his threatening had been incurred and executed after several days, or even weeks or months? Again, in 1 Kings ii. 36, 37, Solomon says to Shimei: 'It shall be on the day that thou goest over the brook Kidron, thou shalt know for certain that thou shalt surely die," &c. &c.

"I take the meaning of Gen. ii. 17 to be, then, that life was *forfeit* by transgression. And this might be the life of the soul no less than of the body; nay, it must appear so if there were no clear intimation that the soul was spared. And the earliest versions and paraphrases, besides able commentators, support the view I have given. The Greek translation of Symmachus (A.D. 200) renders the phrase 'Thou shalt be mortal.' The Syriac gives the same sense, which is accepted by Jerome and by Grotius. The Arabic renders it, 'Thou shalt deserve to die.' The Targum, or paraphrase of Jonathan, 'Thou shalt be subject to death,' or guilty of death (*reus mortis*); in like manner Isidore, of Pelusium, and an eminent Rabbi, Nachmanides." After mentioning several other authorities, he says: "The above are all . . . varieties of the same proleptic sense, and all are varieties of the literal sense. They differ in form only, while they agree in substance. The sense I have given is also approved by Anselm among the mediæval fathers, and by Dr. Knapp and Dr. J. Müller among the modern German divines."

Further on, Professor Hudson says, in connection with what we have quoted above: "And in one or other of the following passages of the New Testament, supposed to sustain the metaphorical sense of death,—Matt. viii. 22, Rom. vi. 11, viii. 11, Eph. ii. 1, 5, Col. ii. 13, 1 Tim. v. 6, Rev. iii. 1,—I find the sense I have given supported by Theodoret, Chrysostom, Augustine, Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Turretin, Calovius, Parens, Calixtus, Gomar, Grotius, Vitringa, Bengel, Michaelis, Bretschneider, Wahl, Rückert, Flatt, Fritzche, Käuffer, Tholuck, Meyer, Hammond, Whitby, Clarke, Macknight. In this view, to be 'dead in trespasses and sins' will mean, to be subject to death by reason of trespasses and sins. And this agrees naturally with the expression in Ezek. xviii. 18: 'He shall die in his iniquity.' And ver. 24: 'In his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die.' And John viii. 21, 24: "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins; for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.'"

We have quoted so largely from this able writer, not only because of the intrinsic worth of his criticism, but also to show how much is to be said, and by how many, in favour of what Canon Garbett considers the

Digitized by Google

Conditionalist view of Gen. ii. 17, and how strongly it is supported by many who are not Conditionalists; and also how, as regards Eph. ii. 1, and Rev. iii. 1, and other kindred passages, the interpretation which many Conditionalists adopt can scarcely be said to be "forced and unnatural to the last degree," and how it certainly does not "prove the viciousness of the system of thought," i.e., of Conditional Immortality, "which compels it;" seeing it has been adopted by so many distinguished authorities, few of whom, none of whom that we are aware of, favoured that system of thought.

But we would further show as we have already intimated that Conditionalists are by no means "compelled to adopt" that interpretation of either Gen. ii. 17, or the other kindred texts. As a matter of fact, some of them do not adopt it. And on the very next page to what we quoted last from Professor Hudson, he expresses his "willingness for argument's sake, to give up any support to his view"—which is ours also of immortality and eternal punishment—"that comes from his interpretation of all these passages." Admitting for argument's sake Canon Garbett's view to be correct, that the death which came upon our first parents and upon the human race in consequence of their sin is soul disease, we say nothing is really gained thereby to the cause of the immortality of the soul and the eternity of torment. For it would still remain to be shown that the disease is not mortal, and that sin is not to the soul what fatal disease is to the body. "A moral and spiritual death may foreshadow . . . a real and final death of the soul." We must say that this interpretation has long seemed to us, to say the least, very doubtful, for this reason, that it confounds sin with its penalty. It makes death identical with sin, or with moral depravity, and lowers the sinner's idea of the death sentence to what we fear many sinners would choose—as they do—rather than refuse, we mean alienation from God. Certainly St. Paul, in Rom. v., vi., vii., viii., seems to us to take, not this metaphorical view of death, but the real and literal view of it, as taking effect in the first death (see Rom. v. 14, vi. 2-11); and as yet to take still fuller effect in the second death of those who reject the offered "gift of God, which is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

5. But Canon Garbett's argument on Gen. ii. 17 seems meant very much to meet what he supposes to be a tenet of Conditionalists, that such words as "death" and "destruction" are never used in a secondary or metaphorical sense. Such is not the case. We all admit that they are occasionally so used. It was absolutely inexcusable of Canon Garbett to say (p. 769) that "It is assumed," i.e. by Conditionalists, "that the word (ἀπόλλυμι) invariably means to reduce to nothing, to annihilate, not the materials, but the thing compounded out of the materials." This utterly incorrect statement enables him to proceed very triumphantly as follows: "Yet in twenty-two out of the eighty-seven times in which the word occurs in the New Testament, it is simply impossible that it should bear such a meaning." Now what are the facts of the case? We turn to what we remember reading some years ago in the RAINBOW (1871, p. 136), from the pen of Dr. G. A. Jacob, on the meaning of ἀπόλλυμι. This eminent scholar, arguing against our position, states the case much more fairly and truly, as follows: "It has been contended that ἀπόλλυμι, —when not signifying 'to lose,'—always means 'to destroy' in such



Digitized by Google

a manner that the object of it *ceases to exist*, and *has no continuance of being*. It is admitted that in the middle voice, and in the second perfect active, ἀπόλωλα, it does mean 'to be ruined,' or 'undone,' &c.; but it has been confidently asserted that such meanings are never found in the other tenses of the active voice: and that ἀπόλλυμι, ἀπολέσω, ἀπώλεσα, ἀπολώλεκα never have the meaning of 'to ruin,' &c., in a transitive or causative sense." This Dr. Jacob disputes, and brings as an instance to the contrary a passage from Demosthenes, about the Phocians being destroyed, or ruined, by Philip, who ἀπώλεσε them. This, however, is very fairly questioned by Dr. R. F. Weymouth, the learned head master of Mill Hill School (see RAINBOW, 1871, p. 187), who maintains that the Phocians, as a Grecian state, *were utterly annihilated*—had *ceased to exist*. But in the course of his reply to Dr. Jacob, he admits that the word is also used figuratively, or hyperbolically, as when one person alive in the body says to another, "He has destroyed me," meaning hyperbolically, "He has killed me outright."

Now all these senses of ἀπόλλυμι, even when not used in the middle voice, or in the second perfect active, are admitted by Conditionalists. So that when Canon Garbett states that "it is assumed that the word invariably means to reduce to nothing: to annihilate not the materials but the thing compounded out of the materials," instead of using that word "invariably," he ought to have specified the following admitted exceptions:—1. When it signifies "to lose," which it does in twenty-six, not merely "twenty-two out of the eighty-seven times in which the word occurs in the New Testament." 2. When it is used in the middle voice. 3. When it is used in the second perfect active. 4. When it is used relatively, not absolutely, as of the Phocians being destroyed or annihilated relatively as a state, but not absolutely, inasmuch as "a few wretched women and children, and some pitiable old men" were left alive. 5. When used hyperbolically, as when an Irishman says, "he's kilt," when he's alive in the body to say it, after being "murdered outright." Even when we deduct these very obvious and admitted exceptions, we have a very strong case—quite as strong as we ever claimed to have—as to the meaning of ἀπόλλυμι in the Word of God.

6. On pp. 771-2 there is an argument to this effect. Our Lord says, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. x. 28). On these words Canon Garbett observes three things. The first two we also observe, and so do most Conditionalists. One is, that soul here means "soul," not "life," as it sometimes does mean. The other is that the soul evidently from this passage survives the killing of the body. But as to the third we cannot quite agree with him. "Thirdly, that the destruction of the soul cannot be a mere act; for, if so, why mention the sphere of destruction—'destroy in hell?'" That word "sphere" is rather formidable. With the Canon's permission, we would substitute for it the simpler word "place." And, first, we would ask why, in the name of common sense, should not the place, sphere, or locality of a mere act of destruction be mentioned, especially when the place, "the Gehenna of fire," suggests also the means of destruction? But, secondly, we have never said that the destruction of the wicked would be "a mere act," "as would be the extinguishing of a flame."

Digitized by Google

Canon Garbett believes in an eternal, never-ending process of destruction for the wicked. He will surely allow us to believe in a process of destruction which will take some time, but be at length completed for ever. He knew that such was our opinion when he wrote, as follows, on p. 680: "It is further to be remembered that some amount of physical torture in hell is held by the advocates of Conditional Immortality. . . . For an undefined time, they say not how long, the souls of the wicked will be tortured in hell and then annihilated." He seems to have forgotten it when he wrote what we have quoted from p. 772.

He asks, indeed (p. 680), "Why the torture, if annihilation is to follow? Why should they be kept alive for the mere purpose of suffering, and not be annihilated at once?" He seems to think it would not be worth while that the wicked should be tortured in hell fire, unless they are tortured there to all eternity. But we answer his questions, revolting as they are:—Because mere annihilation would not be sufficient penalty; there must be the many stripes, or the few stripes, to be inflicted according to greater or less guilt. And we answer him also in another way: If the *death* of Christ was the vicarious penalty of sin, if Christ was to *die* as the sacrifice for sin, why the previous torture? why the agony in the garden? why the scourging? why the crowning of thorns? why the mocking? why the piercing of the sacred hands and feet? why, in fact, the crucifixion? Canon Garbett would probably answer with us, that we have no right to separate the sufferings from the death in which they resulted—the death, which, thank God, ended the sufferings. We must look on the sufferings and the death as one complex whole, as together the one vicarious penalty for sin. And exactly so, he has no right to separate the sinner's penal sufferings from his annihilation which they result in—his annihilation which ends his sufferings. They both make one complex whole. They form together the threatened penalty of "everlasting destruction."

And having so cleared that text, Matt. x. 28, from the Canon's strange third observation on it, we leave it to mean just what it says; that while men can kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul, there is One that can—and surely the words imply that he will*—"destroy both soul and

* Since writing the above we have seen and read a few pages of Canon Farrar's book, "Eternal Hope." and have been greatly struck with the following passage from his preface (p. xl.): "The second passage," which is Matt. x. 28, "merely attributes to God a power which we know the Omnipotent must possess. He *can* destroy the soul; but it says not that he will. If any think that this is implied, it seems to me that no logical choice is open to them but to embrace the theory of Conditional Immortality."

On this we remark:—(1.) That Canon Farrar admits that "destroy" in this passage is used in the sense we attach to it, only he seems to consider our Lord's words as a threat which, if our Lord's hearers—not to say our blessed Lord himself—did not hold Conditional Immortality, must have been a mere idle threat which all knew would never be put in force. (2.) Does Canon Farrar think that the same word, ἀπόλλυμι, has a different meaning when it is used in the passive and rendered "perish," i.e., "be destroyed." in passages where the future doom of the wicked is plainly spoken of—in Luke xiii. 3, 5, John iii. 15, 16. Rom. ii. 12? Or does he think that our Lord's words in Matt. x. 28 imply that God not only can, but will, destroy the body in Gehenna; but that as regards the soul this latter is not implied? It seems so, for he seems to hesitate only about the destroying of the soul. (3.) Canon Garbett and Traditionalists generally think

Digitized by Google

body in hell." What can be plainer testimony against the immortality of the soul? Let it be observed that if "destroy" is used here in any secondary or figurative sense, as of ruining or making miserable, that would not be analogous to killing the soul; and men can, in that secondary figurative sense of the word, "destroy" each other's souls as well as bodies. If our Lord had intended to teach the utter annihilation of the wicked, in what other or stronger words could he have taught it? We know of none. The original word for "destroy" is the very word which some Jews and many Greeks were using in that very day, to say, some—as the Sadducees and the Epicureans—that the soul as well as the body was destroyed at the first death; others—as the Platonists and the Philonists—that the soul would never be destroyed, however the body might be. If our Lord's words had been reported to a Platonising Jew or Greek, he would have at once contradicted them as untrue, according to his philosophy. Indeed, we are not at all sure whether Canon Garbett does not hold that God will destroy—i.e., annihilate—the body in hell, but will never destroy—i.e., annihilate—the soul. He speaks all through like a Greek philosopher of "the immortality of the soul." Why not, like a believer in the Bible as he is, of the immortality of the body as well; or of man in body, soul, and spirit?

It is somewhat germane to some observations we have made above—still more, perhaps, to what we were obliged to say in Part i. p. 60—to notice what we see in the Canon's next paragraph: "If the salvation of the soul only meant that life would be continued after death by the special gift of Christ," &c. But who ever said that it *only* meant anything of the kind? It means, we hold, the beginning, here and now in the regeneration, of the new life that will never end, and of the holiness that will be perfected hereafter. It means all growth in holiness. It means the future glory and honour as well as the immortality, the eternal life, that are promised us in Christ—and that will be given us in the resurrection. No one on our side, we venture to say, has ever said that "the salvation of the soul only means that life would be continued after death," &c. Just as no one on our side maintains that the destruction of the lost would be "a mere act," "as would be the extinguishing of a flame," or that "life" as promised in Christ "means bare existence," is "mere existence, simply being, and no more." These are all gratuitous assumptions of the Canon's which, rather unworthily, we must say, he prefers to deal with, and to argue about, instead of grappling with the arguments we *do* advance, and the statements we *do* make.

W. T. Hobson.

(*To be continued.*)

---

that it is implied in our Lord's words that God *will*, as well as *can*, destroy the soul as well as the body in Gehenna, only they make the word "destroy" mean, as regards the soul at any rate, to torment, a meaning which we venture to say it never properly bears.

Elsewhere (p. 84) Canon Farrar says: "I cannot accept the spreading doctrine of Conditional Immortality." But has he not accepted, in faith or in hope, "that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us" in his Son Jesus Christ? If he has, he has accepted Conditional Immortality whether he has accepted the doctrine of it or not. "God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." This is the doctrine of Conditional life and Immortality.

Digitized by Google

# MR. MAUDE ON THE "RESURRECTION."

## ARTICLE II.—THEORETICAL.

I. IT affords me the most lively satisfaction to profess my entire contentment with several most important theoretic positions taken by Mr. Maude in his able and fruitful articles,—positions more or less fully explained either in his own language or in that of others quoted by him with approval. Viewing them as lying in the range of high probability and using them as working hypotheses wherewith to try and put together this and that fact of revelation or consciousness, I can only say for myself that I accept them as helpful meanwhile, until something better in each several direction offers itself. (1.) As to the great mystery of the Divine Omnipresence, I think I find assistance by trying to conceive of the life-sphere of the Most High as elevated above, differing from, and interpenetrating all others; in such wise as that God's relation to place is in its essential nature unlike that of any created being; and so as that of him it can be said as of none other—He is above all and in all and through all. The only caution I would impose on myself is to distinguish between the essential and the manifested presence of God; and to bear in mind that, after all, it is neither useless nor unmeaning that we are led to conceive of all regions as ranged below some place, "not wholly immaterial," in which God most eminently displays his presence and his glory—which we call the highest heaven; most truly the highest, though perhaps in a supra-mundane sense; where God's throne of glory is, where Jesus our Lord is at God's right hand, where the holy messengers are whose loyalty and love are models to men upon earth; to which therefore we, in lowly imitation of our Lord while on earth, do continually lift up our eyes and evermore aspire. (2.) Also, I most willingly signify my assent to the position that, in all probability, created spirits cannot possess an individualised existence save by the aid of some species of materiality by which their being is limited and defined, brought into relation to place and to the being of God's other creatures, and by means of which also, in part at least, their own self-consciousness is realised. In the case of man, this seems to open up the fundamental relation between spirit and soul in his tripartite nature. It is then seen to be not without reason that man, peculiarly the offspring of God in his spirit, should also have a soul. This reason becomes all the more forcible, in my understanding, if I represent to myself that soul, though certainly not gross matter, is on the other hand not pure spirit. If a middle term between matter and spirit should ever be admissible and admitted, I may then consider it, and prefer to say that the soul is *that*. Meanwhile my own mind is most pleasurably assisted if, while distinguishing spirit from all matter and setting the spirit of man in direct filial relation to the very nature of God, I take the courage to say to myself that undoubtedly the soul is essentially material, however refined its materiality may be. Refined no doubt it is; so refined that no change of earthy particles, however constant and remorseless, can fritter away its substance—it survives the first death itself as the divine provision for a resurrection. But it is related to place; it has affinity for grosser matter; it leads on to corporeal organisation; it may clog and seduce the spirit from which

Digitized by Google

its life is derived; and, with the body, it may be destroyed in the fire of gehenna. Mr. Maude has expressly set forth with approval so much of this representation as relates to the spirit: from what concerns the soul, he cannot I think consistently withhold assent; and, in fact, I surmise he will show no desire so to do.—It is obvious from what has been said that, although sometimes the soul may practically include the spirit, yet at others it may come into distinctive consideration, and it may be imperative to keep the distinction clearly in view. It would, for example, amount to dire misrepresentation should any one elect to use soul and spirit as synonymous, and then charge the present writer with holding that the soul of man is material. Nay! in that looser application of the term soul to the entire incorporeal inner man, I do not hold that the soul is exclusively material; on the contrary, I distinctly maintain that the inmost kernel (or ultimate base and stay) of his being is as immaterial as God himself. But the incorporeal man is complex. Down in that complex inner man a ruinous schism has by sin been made; issuing in a conflict whose agonising cry has come down the ages; and threatening to issue in a destruction so awful and complete that to prevent it the Son of God became man. And those exhibitions of divine truth are presumably the most adequate and the most safe which, behind the conflict, recognise the complexity, and there discern the love of God at work, renewing, harmonising, and restoring, with a view to the uplifting and immortalising of the whole man—the spirit and the soul and the body.

II. I have the further pleasure of saying how entirely I agree with Mr. Maude in respect of certain first principles which though theoretic are not conjectural;—as, for instance, in believing that the effectual recovery of man from death begins in his spirit and proceeds from thence, in regular gradation, to the soul and to the body; and that this recuperative power vouchsafed to the believer's spirit comes from the presence of the Holy Spirit, whose indwelling therefore is the earnest of the resurrection itself. Nor, if certain questionable arguments are dropped, do I think that anything but good can come of Mr. Maude's insistency that the *Anastasis* is, in the case of the believer, a grand and comprehensive process, beginning in grace and ending in glory. We must now pass on from general presuppositions to the SPECIAL THEORY of the resurrection which Mr. Maude has propounded.

III. It is obviously necessary to keep steadily before us what Mr. Maude's theory really is, if we are to form a judgment of its merits. Subject of course to correction, we may perhaps express his theory thus:— (1) That during this life, from regeneration onwards, the future spiritual body of the believer is in course of preparation; (2) that the process by which it is being now made ready, so far as it may be understood by what science would seem to teach, consists in the gradual transfer of the finer elements or rather the ultimate forces of the psychical to the spiritual body; (3) that the agent in carrying forward this process is the quickened and energised human spirit, acting by means of the soul or psychè on the animal or psychical body; (4) that the conserved forces thus derived from the present body, and in a manner representing it, although they are potentially the body that shall be, nevertheless do not come into form as an actual body until death, when

Digitized by Google

the released soul (considered as including the spirit), passing into the etherial (or hadean) life-sphere, at once, by virtue of its stored up powers of embodiment, clothes itself from the refined materials of the etherial life-region, and so stands forth completely robed in its appropriate spiritual organisation, the death of the one body being in fact the birth of the other, with no interval of nakedness experienced; (5) that, nevertheless, the etherial man, complete but not mature, robed but not manifested, attains not his majority until the great consummation, when, entering into the region of the new heavens and new earth, he materialises himself from thence, and so wakes up from the sleep of death into the active and social world of glory to come.

IV. Against this theory certain leading OBJECTIONS present themselves, which may here be briefly stated.

First, *It takes no account of the resurrection of men as men.* The unsaved might not be destined to rise at all, for all this scheme has to say; and yet it is plainly revealed that all the dead will rise. Now, although there may be much in the resurrection of the just that is peculiar to them, yet it seems reasonable to conclude that there are some principles that apply in common to all instances of human recovery from death. In an obvious sense, nature is the foundation of grace: the new creation is superinduced upon the old. And therefore we may assume it as probable that the saints will rise in a manner best understood when the provisions of redemption are viewed in connection with the natural capacities of the creature redeemed. In other words, if to any degree we can get to understand how man as man will rise to judgment, we must surely be in so much the better a position to understand how man as regenerate rises to glory. Consequently, if it were only for the sake of the special theory, we are fain to wish for at least the rudiments of a more general one. Besides which it is obvious to remark that a too persistent keeping out of sight of the rising of the unjust is not likely to be without results which may unintentionally prejudice truth itself. For although theory and fact are ever so carefully distinguished from each other, yet as one of the ends of theorising is presumably the better appreciation of the facts in evidence, it is to be gravely apprehended that a too ready and long continued dismissal of all theoretic interest and effort, may in some minds induce a feeble grasp of the facts themselves, —which, indeed, not being sought for, may very possibly not be found, or, being found but not much considered, may seem to possess but little weight. And, therefore, for both reasons, it is to be regretted that Mr. Maude has so constantly kept the resurrection of the unjust—nay, not of the unjust alone, but of man as man—out of the view.

Secondly, *it takes too little account of the soul in the resurrection of believers.* This defect is probably very closely connected with that already named, and both may have sprung from some want of firmness in the hold on the peculiar function of the soul in the tripartite nature of man. Mr. Maude grants that in the soul lies the personality; that in the soul abide the form and ideal of the body; and that in the soul man has the ability to assimilate to himself inferior elements, and construct for himself an appropriate organism. It can hardly be doubted that these admissions *imply* all that could be desired. And yet it might have been well if Mr. Maude had said in so many words that in the soul lies

Digitized by Google

the identity of the present psychical body. That might have withheld him from appearing to find the identity of the body elsewhere, even in that inner spiritual body which is peculiar to the regenerate.* It might have suggested to him to admit that in the surviving soul of the non-regenerate lies the divine provision for their bodily resurrection. And—which is the immediate point before us—it might have led him to say something about the renewal and elevation of the soul itself, distinctively considered, in the great process of reconstruction unto life eternal:—as, for example, whether probably it is the part of the soul to take into itself the holy character formed in this life under divine discipline, with the result of perpetuating it for ever, and even of throwing it out into relief in lineaments of beauty in the heavenly body itself; and whether again there is any reason to think that the very substance of the soul is being made, or will be made, more refined than it now is, so that its inherent affinities will be more heavenly, more nearly allied to the God-like nature of the spirit itself, to whose motions it shall then instinctively respond. And, lastly, it might have restrained him from rather seriously anticipating the crowning act of the resurrection—an anticipation so marked, and withal so likely to prove a stubborn hindrance to what is probably true in his theory, that a more formal indication of it appears to be demanded. And so it must be further objected to Mr. Maude's theory that,—

Thirdly, *It needlessly anticipates the crowning act of the resurrection.* That it does anticipate, by attributing too much to the day of death and too little to the day of resurrection, is tolerably evident. Mr. Maude, speaking of the spiritual body at death, says: "When, the material organism being dropped in death, it [the spiritual body] shall stand forth, as we believe it will stand forth, the perfect objective embodiment of the spiritual and moral character we have formed on earth" (p. 550). Moreover he expressly though warily says: "At death it may perhaps be said—holding to the analogy—that the spiritual body is *born*, yet not even then does it attain to the full development of its nature: there is, in all probability, a spiritual infancy in hades, even as there is a physical infancy on earth" (p. 467). It must be evident that the birth of the spiritual body will complete its formation and constitute its entrance upon *the* life to which it is destined. At our natural birth we definitively and once for all make our entrance into the life-sphere in which we remain uninterruptedly as long as we live. There is no nature-crisis between infancy and manhood comparable to birth. And therefore Mr. Maude does, in fact,—though plainly *against* his intention—make death coincident with the

* "It is a body 'in the heavens' . . . a body of substantial forces which the soul pervades and holds in indissoluble union with itself as essentially and fundamentally our body; that body around which the passing perishable elements of the earth-made organism are throughout this life ever gathering and again dispersing. . . . It is this spiritual body in which, in point of fact, Professor Westcott's 'specific law or formula of assimilation and combination,' and Professor Perowne's 'principle of identity which governs the formation of the body' will find their actual realisation" (p. 371). This seems pretty evidently to refer to that principle of identity which governs the formation of *every* human body; and yet it would appear to be referred to the spiritual body, which, one would have thought, was peculiar to the regenerate. I am not sure that I understand the paragraph.

Digitized by Google

essential resurrection. And, furthermore, his references to our Lord's resurrection in illustration of this point are clearly capable of being turned against him, to the demolition of this part of his theory; notwithstanding the exceeding beauty and manifest truthfulness of many of his observations on this part of his subject. He says, of the Saviour's risen body, that it "was essentially a spiritual body in which he could stand in the midst of his disciples unseen and undetected, but when he wished to manifest himself and hold intercourse with them, that spiritual body condensed and hardened into materialism, even as water hardens into ice. In other words he was able, as we shall be able, to pass at will from the etherial to the material, and *vice versa*" (p. 555). And so, by the way, our Lord had not to wait for the coming of the new earth before he could materialise his new body: how then comes it to pass that they who are to bear his image should need to wait so long ere they can materialise theirs? The point in hand, however, lies in this: that we are to be able, like our Lord, to pass at will from the etherial to the material, and *vice versa*. In other words, our Lord's resurrection was not at all dependent upon his materialising himself, nor identical with it; and his continuance in his risen body was in no way contingent on his retaining his materialism. Now, inasmuch as in this very thing we are to be like our glorious Redeemer, does it not follow that our materialising ourselves sinks into a question of very inferior importance? Accordingly, when we get our materialism, we shall not need to keep it always about us. Indeed, seeing that we shall probably be, as Mr. Maude beautifully says, "practically free of the universe," is it not fair to assume that we shall often use our freedom? Our wardrobe will be inexhaustible; and so, no doubt, whether from dutiful occasion or from spontaneous delight, we shall, at intervals, evermore be changing our robes, according to the errand we have to go on or the company we wish to appear in—now, in one garb, appearing to lowly travellers by the way; and now, in richer adorning, making sudden appearance on our erewhile vacant throne amidst assembled courtiers and swift-winged messengers; and then, the session ended, speeding our way to some distant sphere, there also, as the case may be, to materialise or etherialise ourselves at will, either after the manner of the country or as those who from afar have come. Thus and so will be our high prerogative: a garment more or less will be neither here nor there. But to be "*born*" is a serious affair: we presume we shall not be born and re-born *at will!* Hence Mr. Maude must kindly bear with me, if, returning to the charge, I repeat that according to his own express illustration, that which confessedly ought to be the crowning act of the *Anastasis* will be no crowning act at all, but on the contrary one liable and likely to be everlastingly repeated. Our Lord rose once: he manifested himself—and according to Mr. Maude materialised himself—many times. His materialising himself was not his resurrection; and therefore according to this showing our materialising ourselves will not be our resurrection. No! the whole assembly of the firstborn is waiting with eager outlook, and all creation is sighing with nameless painful longing, for the consummation which is to be signalled by the archangel's voice and the divine trumpet's blast; and, when that consummation comes, this is what it will be—out of an exhaustless wardrobe, the saints will merely put on for

Digitized by Google

the first time one garment of a certain texture and pattern; and this is to happen perhaps long years or centuries after their etherial birth has taken place and their etherial training up to etherial manhood has begun, during which years or centuries our spiritual bodies will have been standing forth as the perfect objective embodiment of grace received and character formed on earth. How far this singular result comes of some unaccountable incertitude in Mr. Maude's mind as to how gross matter must be to be matter at all (so that he allows himself at times to imply that it must be so gross that because a body is etherial therefore it cannot be material, and if it were material then it must needs be visible to all eyes); or how far it arises from a similarly surprising indecision in his use of the designation "spiritual body" (so that one while it seems to be a body made of spirit, then again it would appear to be a body "not wholly immaterial," but simply a body which though material is yet fully penetrated and possessed by spirit); into these curious problems it is unnecessary further to adventure. My one object here is to substantiate the objection that Mr. Maude does really and seriously, though against his own most evident intention, anticipate and antedate the consummating act of the resurrection. And now let it be added that for this haste there seems to have been no theoretic need whatever. That no scientific need exists may be reasonably inferred from the singularly cautious words of the authors of *The Unseen Universe*: "We conceive it to be quite possible, if otherwise likely, that the spiritual body may remain veiled or in abeyance until the resurrection." (Rainbow, 1877, p. 374.) That there is any metaphysical necessity for it can scarcely be shown if it be admitted that the soul is the principle of the identity of the body that now is; for if it gives identity to this body, it may form quite a sufficient link of identity between this and that which shall be. Whether there be any biblical necessity our remaining articles perhaps will show; but meanwhile we assume what we believe in submitting there is none.

V. It is with considerable reluctance, and only in the persuasion that it is due from me, that I venture on the hazardous task of seeming to propound a theory of my own. In fact, I would merely for convenience bring together the scattered suggestions which I have already presumed to make, and humbly beg they may be accepted simply as theoretic hints for comparison with a view to improvement or rejection:—

*First*, that in the case of all men it is the peculiar divinely given function of the soul to form for itself an appropriate body; that of its body it is the life-long principle of identity; that it receives into itself the character which during life is wrought out; that, though at death it loses its earthly organism, it nevertheless retains its original power of self-embodiment under divinely granted conditions; that its survival with this power constitutes a provision for a resurrection; but that if no elevation of its nature supervene, it can only receive a second body like the first, akin to itself, psychical, corruptible, and liable with itself to ultimate destruction.

*Secondly*, that in the case of the regenerate, the spirit is constituted by the Holy Spirit a principle of holy, reconstructive, elevating, and abiding life to the whole man, designed to carry forward the process of renewal until both soul and body are brought within its embrace; that

Digitized by Google

this process is advanced partly by the maturing of a worthy character which the soul receives into itself for perpetuation, partly by the lifting up of the soul itself into closer affinity with its inspiring spirit, so that from being subterranean it shall become heavenly in substance and sympathy [and partly, *perhaps*, in the projecting from our present bodies and storing up in the heavenlies the essential materialism wherewith our future glorious bodies shall be formed]; and finally that at the sovereign word of the Redeemer, it (the spirit), by means of its thus prepared soul [and perhaps out of its already treasured up materialism], shall once for all clothe itself with a true and substantial and material body, adapted to its wants, subservient to its wishes, and by the degree of its glory exactly representative of the redeemed man's rightful status in the world to come.

* JOSEPH B. ROTHERHAM.

(*To be continued.*)

---

## ANGELS OF EARTH.

EARTH hath its angels, though their forms are moulded,
But of such clay as fashions all below;
Though harps are wanting and bright pinions folded,
We know them by the love-light on their brow.

I have seen angels by the sick one's pillow;
Theirs was the soft tone and the noiseless tread:
When smitten hearts were drooping like a willow,
They stood between the living and the dead.

And if my sight, by earthly dimness hindered,
Beheld no radiant messengers in air,
I doubt not, for all spirits know their kindred,
They smiled upon the wingless watchers there.

There have been angels in the gloomy prison,
In crowded hall, by the lone widow's hearth;
And where they passed the fallen have uprisen,
The giddy paused, the mourner's hope had birth.

I have seen one whose eloquence commanding
Roused the deep echoes of the human breast,
The blandishments of ease and wealth withstanding,
That hope might reach the suffering and oppressed.

And by his side there moved a form of beauty,
Strewing sweet flowers along the path of life,
And looking up with meek and love-born duty;
I called her angel, but he called her wife.

Ah! many a spirit walks the earth unheeded,
That when its veil of sadness is laid down,
Shall soar aloft with pinions unimpeded,
And wear its glory like a starry crown.

* ABRAHAM BENSON.

Digitized by Google

# THE DIVINE SENTENCE ON SIN.

SIN—even one sin—is rebellion, and is nothing less than a capital offence committed against the Divine Majesty of heaven, and admits of no punishment short of capital punishment; for no other punishment, however prolonged or severe which spares the forfeited life, can vindicate the divine law or satisfy offended justice.

The penalty attached to the one single transgression is, "Thou shalt surely die." There is no possible way of evading this law, which is the beginning and foundation of all law. Satan may promise a commutation of the just sentence; he may say, "ye shall not surely die;" but "he was a liar from the beginning, and the father of it," and the reception of his lie by all who have given credence to it from the first moment he uttered it to the present time, has not, and cannot, alter or modify in the least degree the divine sentence as it stands recorded on the divine statute book of eternal truth. From God has gone forth the irrevocable sentence, "Thou shalt surely die;" "The wages of sin is death;" "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "Therefore, by one offence judgment came upon all men to condemnation." (Romans v. 18, *margin.*)

Satan, the opposer of God, has declared it null and void. Whose word shall stand? The lie of Satan succeeded in drawing man from his proper and rightful allegiance to his Creator. "Adam was not deceived." (1 Tim. ii. 14.) He wilfully believed the lie of Satan, "Ye shall not surely die," rather than the righteous decree of God, "Ye shall surely die." And thus he became a wilful transgressor of that holy law, the penalty of which is death, expressed in terms so plain, simple, and clear that there can be no misunderstanding.

But even here the mercy of God interposed to prevent the transgressor becoming—what we are now taught and required to believe in order that we may be considered evangelical and orthodox—immortal in sin.

Adam wilfully, deliberately, lawlessly, partook of that fruit which gave him a knowledge of good and evil, and now his access to the tree of life must in mercy be prevented, lest he should become immortal in his sin: "And the Lord God said, Behold the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever:—Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life. (Gen. iii. 22-24.) The sentence of death was therefore irrevocable, and its execution was certain; a brief respite was allowed, but this was all. There could be no uncertainty now; the enemy, death, could only for a brief space be held at bay; the continuance of man's life was but a respite, not a reprieve; for life was forfeited. The sentence was no longer a threatening; it was a certain reality; death was not now a possibility, but a stern necessity, from which there was no remission nor release. It was the execution of the Divine Mandate, the curse pronounced on disobedience, which left not even a faint dream of hope for sinful man.

Digitized by Google

God had given to his creature man, life, and he had forfeited it, and death was now his just portion. The difference between life and death is so great and comprehensive, that in the Word of God the terms are used to express the most direct of all opposites, and the most extreme of all contraries. Notice carefully the following passages: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God: and not that he should return from his ways and live?" "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Doubtless, the execution of the sentence of death would have instantly followed Adam's transgression, had it not been postponed by the mediation of the the Lord Jesus Christ. "He saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor: therefore his arm brought salvation unto him; and his righteousness, it sustained him." The words literally, "Dying, thou shalt die" (see marginal reading), expressed the certainty of the execution of the sentence. We have a beautiful illustration of this recorded: "And the king sent and called for Shimei, and said unto him, Build thee an house in Jerusalem, and dwell there, and go not forth thence any whither. For it shall be, that on the day thou goest out, and passest over the brook Kidron, thou shalt know for certain thou shalt surely die: thy blood shall be upon thy own head. And Shimei said unto the king, The saying is good: as my lord the king hath said, so will thy servant do. And Shimei dwelt in Jerusalem many days. And it came to pass at the end of three years, that two of the servants of Shimei ran away unto Achish son of Maachah king of Gath, and they told Shimei, saying, Behold thy servants be in Gath. And Shimei arose, and saddled his ass, and went to Gath to Achish to seek his servants: and Shimei went, and brought his servants from Gath. And it was told Solomon that Shimei had gone from Jerusalem to Gath, and was come again. And the king sent and called for Shimei, and said unto him, Did I not make thee to swear by the Lord, and protested unto thee, saying, Know for a certain, on the day thou goest out, and walkest abroad any whither, that thou shalt surely die? and thou saidst unto me, The word that I have heard is good. Why, then, hast thou not kept the oath of the Lord, and the commandment that I have charged thee with? The king said moreover to Shimei, Thou knowest all the wickedness which thine heart is privy to, that thou didst to David my father: therefore the Lord shall return thy wickedness upon thine own head; and king Solomon shall be blessed, and the throne of David shall be established before the Lord for ever. So the king commanded Benaiah the son of Jehoiada; which went out and fell upon him, that he died, and the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon. (1st Kings ii. 36-46; see also Ex. x. 28.) It was now declared that "The seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head." That he should come into the world to bear the penalty due to man's transgression; therefore it is

Digitized by Google

written: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted; but he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed; and ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins, and in him is no sin; for he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him; for God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved."

It will thus be seen that our blessed Lord suffered in his own holy person all the penalty due to our transgression, and fully vindicated the righteous and holy law of God, even that law which demanded the death of the sinner. He, the holy, perfect, and spotless one, "in whom was no sin," drank the bitter cup, and made a full end of iniquity, and thus: "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the thing which he suffered: and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." "God commendeth his love to us, in that while we were yet sinners (under the just sentence of death) Christ died for us." If our Lord Jesus Christ did not meet and fully satisfy all the just requirements of the divine law, and thus indicate its holiness, we are still under its sentence; for the law of a holy God is unchangeable, and cannot be tampered with or evaded in the least degree.

By his death and resurrection we are either removed for ever from under the full curse of the broken law, or the work of our redemption is still unfinished. And if the full penalty has not been borne, the sentence, "Ye shall surely die," is still the just and holy record against us. But, blessed be his holy name, he hath said, "Deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom; for even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many; for there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." "He laid down his life for the sheep;" "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures;" "when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his son;" "He made his soul an offering for sin;" "He poured out his soul unto death;" "When we were without strength" (i.e. destitute of any power or ability to even help to save ourselves), "Christ died for the ungodly;" "For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die; but God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him: greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life

Digitized by Google

for his friends. Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us. In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." The uniform and constant testimony of the holy Scriptures is, that, "When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." (James i. 15.) The lust or desire, "to be as gods, knowing good from evil," caused our first parents to eat of the forbidden fruit, and then lust brought forth the sin of unbelief,—doubting God's Word,—the fruit of which was death.

But Christ exhausted the full penalty of the broken law, when he suffered the pain and sorrow, and death of the cross. We read: "Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst. Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar, and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop, and put it to his mouth. When Jesus therefore received the vinegar, he said, It is finished, and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost. (John xix. 28-30.) Thus "blotting out the writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in himself" (margin, Col. ii. 14, 15). Having thus triumphed over all the power of darkness, he calmly commended his spirit unto his Father's hands: "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit; and having said thus, he gave up the ghost." (Luke xxiii. 46.) Now the holy law of God is vindicated, the full penalty due to sin has been borne, and yet men speak of "a death that never dies," of "everlasting torments," of unending misery and pain as the wages of sin. If such a theory be true, Christ has not made a complete atonement for sin: for "He rose again from the dead on the third day." We, through God's grace, thankfully believe the simple record of holy Scripture. "Christ died for our sins;" "he poured out his soul even unto death;" "He gave his life for his sheep;" "He tasted death for every one of us." He bore the divinely-appointed penalty due to our sins, and we are free. "He died on account of our sins, and rose on account of our justification;" and, thus having been justified, faith appropriates this fact, and "we have peace with God."

It is a blasphemous and unreasonable thought to suppose that "he who was made sin for us" did not exhaust the penalty due to sin to its fullest extent. For if there is any punishment recorded in God's Word as due to sin, or the sinner, which he has not fully met and completely borne for us, then we are still under that penalty, and he has not made "an end of sins." (Dan. ix. 24.)*

Blessed be the Lord, the answer of our God to all such doubtings is: "Thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is purged." "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will

* If a single sinner be left to suffer eternal torments, the reign of evil will never end, and thus Christ will fail to accomplish his mission as here declared, and Satan would triumph.



Digitized by Google

I remember no more." "He was manifested to put away sin." The Scriptures of truth nowhere declare that eternal torment, or unending misery, is the penalty of sin, or assert that the wicked have, or even shall have, eternal life. Satan is the author of this falsehood. On the contrary, our Lord himself has declared, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John iii. 36.) Even that wrath which has declared, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "The wages of sin is death." If immortality is inherent, if all men are created immortal, how can eternal life be the gift of God through Jesus Christ?

Surely the traditions of men have made the Word of God of no effect, corrupting the Word of God. Alas! how often do we find those whose opinions have no other or better foundation than the mere traditions of men, denouncing in the bitterest manner and in most unmeasured terms the faith of those who, in obeying the Holy Ghost (2 Cor. x. 5), "Casting down imaginations (or reasonings), and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ," are content to refer this and every other question to the Word of God alone as the supreme arbiter of faith, knowing that "He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true" (John iii. 33). "For what if some did not believe, shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged" (Rom. iii. 3, 4).

It has been well said, "Traditional Christianity is real infidelity; for it denies the Scriptures, which assert their own sufficiency, and make themselves the standard." And again, "What is an opinion? Two hundred millions of civilised men are the slaves of an opinion, and that opinion makes them the vassals of popery."

Let us now carefully consider the testimony of the Scriptures, for by these alone we ought to be guided in all things; they alone are the unerring standard of faith. Therefore let us inquire, What do the Scriptures teach us respecting the punishment of sin, and the final destiny of the sinner?

First, the divine law given to the first Adam, as the representative head of the race, reads, "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. ii. 16, 17). We have, in the next place, the sentence and penalty pronounced as the wages of disobedience. "And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life: thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field: in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return. And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also

Digitized by Google

of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever;—Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life" (Gen. iii. 17-19, 22-24). So man was left to prove, by sorrowful experience, whether the words of the deceiver were true or false, "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil," until the days of Noah.

The sixth of Genesis unfolds to us his history: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man, whom I have created, from the face of the earth; both man and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air: for it repenteth me that I have made them. The earth also was corrupt before God; and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them: and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth." Did God execute this sentence as it is here recorded? Did his decree, "I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth," fail? The divine record is, "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died. And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark." Thus we see "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent (or change his purpose); hath he said, and shall he not do? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?" (Num. xxiii. 19.)

We may now inquire, What has God declared since the judgment of the flood respecting the wicked? What has he pronounced as the punishment of sin? The book of the Psalms, in a pre-eminent degree, speaks not only of the joys and glories awaiting the people of God, but in like manner declares the punishment awaiting the wicked, or ungodly; and here we shall discover, by a careful consideration of the words used and the figures employed by the Holy Spirit, that he has used only those words and those figures which give us an idea of utter destruction, and in no single instance has he given us a figure or used any language denoting their preservation in eternal woe and misery.

In the Psalms it is written, "The ungodly are like the chaff which the wind driveth away; for the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, but the way of the wicked shall perish" (Psa. i. 4, 5). "Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing: the Lord will abhor the bloody and deceitful man" (Psa. v. 6). "Thou hast rebuked the heathen; thou hast destroyed the wicked; thou hast put out their name for ever and ever" (Psa. ix. 5). "Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and



Digitized by Google

brimstone, and a horrible tempest; this shall be the portion of their cup" (Psa. x. 6). "Thy hand shall find out all thine enemies; thy right hand shalt find out those that hate thee; thou shalt make them as a fiery oven in the time of thine anger: the Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall devour them. Their fruit shalt thou destroy from the earth, and their seed from among the children of men" (Psa. xxi. 8-10). "Fret not thyself because of evildoers, neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity. For they shall soon be cut down like the grass, and wither as the green herb. For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be: yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be. But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away."

Again, the psalmist contrasts the goodness of God with the end of the mighty man: "Why boastest thou thyself in mischief, O mighty man? the goodness of God endureth continually. God (even him whose goodness endureth continually) shall destroy thee for ever; he shall take thee away, and pluck thee out of thy dwelling place, and root thee out of the land of the living" (Psa. lii. 1, 5). How glorious and blessed to anticipate the fulfilment of God's sure word, which can never fail. "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth. The glory of the Lord endureth for ever: the Lord shall rejoice in his works. He looketh on the earth, and it trembleth: he toucheth the hills, and they smoke. I will sing unto the Lord as long as I live: I will sing praise unto my God while I have my being. My meditation of him shall be sweet: I will be glad in the Lord. Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more. Bless thou the Lord, O my soul. Praise ye the Lord." (Psa. civ. 29-35.)

A. FORBES PORTER.

(*To be concluded.*)

---

# THE ELECT AND THE NATIONS.

"The nations (of them that are saved) shall walk in the light of it (the New Jerusalem)."—Rev. xxi. 24.

THIS passage, it appears to me, is one of the most comforting in the whole Bible, and may in fact be said to strike the key-note of the harmony of revelation. It refers clearly to the almost forgotten, and certainly much ignored, truth—that *the elect are totally distinct from the nations.*

In the first place, it should be observed that the words in the above passage, which appear within brackets, are omitted in all the oldest MSS.; and that, therefore, the clause should read thus: "The nations (τὰ ἔθνη) shall walk in the light of it." Alford accordingly so reads it in his New Testament, and there is, I think, little doubt that the words in question were inserted in the text by some would-be orthodox

Digitized by Google

transcriber, who thought to make the Word of God more perfect by adding thereto. No doubt the nations above referred to are in one sense *saved*, but they are not saved in the highest sense of the word.

On the general question involved Alford observes: "The city shall be so bright as to serve for light—for sun and moon both—to the world that then is and her inhabitants; . . . for such inhabitants are clearly supposed." And again, he says, "Among the mysteries of this new earth this is set forth to us, that besides the glorified Church there shall still be dwelling on the renewed earth nations organised under kings and saved by means of the influences of the heavenly city. . . . If, then, the kings of the nations bring their glories and their treasures unto her, and if none shall ever enter into her that are not written in the book of life, it follows that these kings and these nations are written in the book of life. And so perhaps some light may be thrown on one of the darkest mysteries of redemption. There may be—I say it with all diffidence—those who have been saved by Christ without ever forming part of his visible organised Church."

Now here, I think, that though Alford is perfectly right as far as he goes, he does not go half so far as legitimate deduction from this passage would warrant him in doing. The fair deduction is, I think, this: that the elect—risen and glorified—are the *dwellers* in the New Jerusalem, while the nations are infinitely below them in glory. And, furthermore, we have every reason to suppose that "the nations" will be proportionately numerous, as compared with "the elect," as were the nations of the world in the days of Solomon as compared with the Jews. The one body may be compared to the sand on the sea shore, the other to the stars of heaven. In other words, mankind as a race will be saved and permitted to exist on the new earth, while the elect will be the glorified dwellers in the New Jerusalem.

The New Jerusalem will be in the age to come what the earthly Jerusalem might have been to the nations of the present world. Indeed, for a very short time it would seem that the first Jerusalem was permitted to fulfil its mission; so much so that the kings of the earth flocked unto it. In like manner in the new earth we find that the kings thereof bring their glory and honour unto "Jerusalem the golden," and learn from the true Solomon the knowledge of the Most High. As the great High Priest upon his throne, and therefore with unlimited, unquestionable, and absolutely unassailable power, our Lord will reign over the earth; while his elect—pillars, as it were, in the temple of God—will go out no more; but all who seek to know God will come to them for wisdom and guidance. That which all nations are now looking for, and which in various ways they seek to obtain—sometimes by main force and sometimes by blind groping—but always unsuccessfully, will then be found.

All history, and all our experience of life, alike prove that as a rule the masses of mankind *desire to be led*, and this instinct which now too often leads them to put confidence in fallible men, will then be directed aright to those who will be infallible, because, being "the spirits of just men made perfect" they will be the representatives of Christ himself.

The great declaration of Jehovah on the subject of the separation of the Jews from the other nations of the earth, and that which gives us the

Digitized by Google

key to the whole of his dealings with them, is that contained in Exodus xix. 3-6: "And Moses went up to God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel: Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." The same is repeated in Deuteronomy vii. 6: "For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth."

Now, the great point to be noticed in all this is, that the Jews were chosen simply *above* all nations. Other nations are not utterly cast off, cursed, or neglected, because the Jews are chosen; they are merely placed in a position of comparative *inferiority*. In other words, though the Jews were *separated* from the rest of the world, the separation only implied *superiority*. In the above quoted passages it is distinctly declared that all the earth is the Lord's, and not the land of Judea only. *All* people, every human being that ever existed, all nations, tribes, and tongues, are the work and care of God. They are all his creatures, and in him they live and move and have their being. But, in perfect accordance with all that we see of God's works, there is as distinct a gradation visible among nations as there is among individuals. Consequently some must be superior, and some inferior; but, nevertheless, *all* have their various positions assigned to them, and all have advantages and functions peculiar to themselves. To the Jew was given the inestimable privilege of being the channel through which Divine truth was presented to the world. The descendants of Abraham were to be priests unto God; and so they were, until they mingled with the heathen and learned their works.

If we take the great promise of God to Abraham,—the charter of the human race, as it has been not inaptly called,* we find the same grand distinction brought out. "In thee, and in thy seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xxviii. 14); i.e., in and through the race of the true Israel, as intermediaries, shall flow the blessings of God to the whole human race. And with this distinct prophecy accords most fully the remarkable statement in Deuteronomy: "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel: for the Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of His inheritance" (xxxii. 8, 9). In the LXX. we read: "He set the bounds of the nations according to the number of the angels of God." Whichever may be the true reading, the meaning would seem to be that special glory and honour, and that in respect of their leadership over the nations, was intended for the elect people of God. "This people have I formed for myself, they shall show forth my praise" (Isa. xliii. 21).

Surely, then, every unprejudiced reader must come to the conclusion that the design of the Almighty was that through Israel the knowledge of himself might be spread throughout the world. This design,

* See Head on Redemption.

Digitized by Google

like all the other designs of the Most High, though it has been deferred for a time, shall assuredly one day be brought to pass, and the true Israel shall be the real *lights* of the world. Man may *impede*, but he can never *prevent* the accomplishment of God's purposes in all their fulness, beauty, and glory; and though to our eyes the world may seem utterly forgotten of its Maker, yet it will surely be one day seen that never for one single moment has this really been the case, but that through all the darkness, the misery, and the suffering of the world, the magnificent promise and oath of the Almighty to Abraham has constantly been kept in view.

Again, the wonderful and glorious declaration of the prophet Isaiah, quoted by our Lord, "My house shall be called an house of prayer for all people," implies that all the nations had a share, so to speak, in that temple. It was neither built nor designed exclusively for the Jews. "Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer" (Isa. lvi. 6, 7). All who came to this holy house were equally with the Jews, or at all events after the Jews, to have a share in the privileges conferred upon the worshippers therein.

Now of this house the elect are the spiritual antitypes; the Lord Jesus himself, of course, being the chief corner stone, "In whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord" (Eph. ii. 21). And so St. Peter, "To whom coming as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye also, as living stones, are being built up (present tense) a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. ii. 4). The temple, then, was the type or shadow of things in the heavenly places, just as Jerusalem itself was; and accordingly we have reason to anticipate that the risen saints, in the new earth, will occupy a place analogous to that which the Jews held in the present earth in their best and brightest days. The spiritual house will surely be as truly "an house of prayer for all nations" as was the earthly house, and all nations shall see and rejoice in its light.

The holy city, New Jerusalem, will indeed be the light of the world, and shall, so to speak, form the connecting link between the new heavens and the new earth. In the first or present earth Jerusalem was in fact designed to be so; but because of the unfaithfulness of the Jews the fine gold became dim, and the light of the "city set upon an hill" became darkness. But *this* city shall in truth be "a burning and a shining light," never to be extinguished. Surely the images of a city set on a hill, and of a great and high mountain, imply that it is *meant* to be seen by all, and will be the great object of attraction in the new earth. Its exceeding height is no doubt meant to teach us that it is visible to all, and indeed cannot but be seen by all.

To every nation on the face of the earth God has given some special and definite part or office to perform. That part may not be always evident to us, but in many cases it is obvious enough. To the great Roman empire, for example, was given power and authority over the greater part of the known world, with the view, apparently, that the

Digitized by Google

great principles of law and order might be proclaimed and duly recognised; and though Rome abused this power, yet she so far fulfilled her mission that the civilised world has been enabled to perceive that only by obedience to law and duty can authority be properly maintained, or peace lastingly secured. The division of Europe at the present day into separate and distinct kingdoms is in itself a sufficient proof of this, for they have one and all more or less learned the lesson, or at all events are learning it, that only by obedience to law can nations prosper.

Even so in the new earth, the nations will be organised under kings and rulers, each one having its definite sphere assigned to it. The command of God to Noah and his descendants to "replenish the earth and subdue it" will probably still hold good; for though at that time Nature will have been greatly ameliorated, still there will be room for the exercise of those habits of order and industry which have been acquired on earth.

If we may at all reason from analogy, we have every ground for supposing that the new earth will be the analogue of the present. The prophet Isaiah tells us that "God created not the earth in vain, he formed it to be inhabited" (Isa. xlv. 18); and this will be equally true in principle of the new earth. It will be inhabited by men who will be just as suited and adapted to it as we are to this present world. Adam, in Paradise, was not freed from the necessity of work, though that work was neither severe nor toilsome. He was placed in the garden "to dress it and to keep it," and consequently *work* of some kind or other is not only natural but desirable for man, and I think it will be so even in the new earth.

Over the earth thus renovated and "receiving blessing of God" it will be the privilege of *the elect* to rule. To them—so as to be at their disposal—will flow in all the wealth, all the goodness and fatness, so to speak, of the earth. They will be the guides and instructors of humanity, ready to assist and glad to give counsel and advice to all that seek their aid.

There are many indications in the announcements of the prophets, that in this new earth "the nations" will still require such aid and instruction; that they are not in fact *equal* in knowledge, in power, or in nearness to God with the dwellers in the heavenly city. Among the most important of these announcements is that in Rev. xxii. 2: "The leaves of the tree are for the healing of the nations." The fruit of the tree of life is only for the elect,—they, and they alone, are permitted "to eat of the tree of life" (Rev. ii. 7); but the *leaves* are for the benefit of the nations. Surely this implies a vast difference in the status of the two classes. The use, too, of the words "kings and priests" unto God indicates a grand subdivision in the future of the *subjects* as distinguished from the *rulers*.

Every argument from analogy, also, would seem to teach us that there must be differences and gradations of rank and condition hereafter. All the *elect*—those who have here "made their calling and election sure"—will doubtless have direct access to their heavenly Father, but it is exceedingly doubtful whether this will be the case with the *nations*. The royal priesthood will apparently be the intermediaries between God and his creatures; though even between the individuals composing this priesthood there will probably be differences of rank. St. Paul tells us that "one star differeth from another star in glory;" and as he uses

Digitized by Google

this fact as being illustrative of the condition of "the saints hereafter," —those who shall attain unto the first resurrection, of whom alone he appears to be speaking,—we are justified in concluding that everywhere there will be gradation in order and rank hereafter. The answer of our Lord to the mother of James and John seems distinctly to declare that those only for whom those positions have been prepared will sit, the one on his right hand and the other on his left, in his kingdom.

If, as many of us believe, the holy city New Jerusalem, described in the last two chapters of Revelation, and which is not seen until the first heavens and the first earth have passed away, represents the saints, what can be the meaning of the expression "the kings of the earth," unless it refers to the rulers of "the nations," as opposed to the *elect nation?* Here, I think, we find the fulfilment of the well-known passage in Isaiah (xlix. 2, 3): "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers." The promise having reference not to this earth in its present state, but to the earth renewed, glorified, and reigned over by the Messiah as King of kings and Lord of lords.

The Church, as his Bride, reigns with Christ in the New Jerusalem, the kings of the earth are those who do *not* form any portion of that glorious number, and who come as *suppliants* and *worshippers* unto the city. How could such a term as "suppliants" be applied to the saints who are sitting down with Christ in his throne? Such an expression applied to them would obviously be without meaning. These "kings of the earth" would seem to be those who, though not forming part of the elect Church, are nevertheless next in rank to that august body, and are in fact the noblest and best of earth *after* the saints. Edward Irving has very justly remarked that "there may be thousands of grades of glory distinguished from the glory of the elect Church." There would seem to be, in fact, in the new earth almost as great differences of rank and condition as there are in this present earth; the only difference—but how great is that difference—being that *therein* "dwelleth righteousness." God is then to be the King of the whole earth, and his will is to be done on earth as it is in heaven. When that shall be the case, then, and then only, will it be seen how great is the dignity and glory to be given to them "whom the King delighteth to honour."

* T. W.

---

# OUR MOTHER TONGUE,

## AS SPOKEN AND WRITTEN BY ALL RANKS IN ENGLAND.

(*Concluded from page* 221.)

WANT to, mean to, are common errors. Thus: "Will you go with us?" "I don't want to." "Are you going out to-day?" "I mean to, if able." I am obliged to own that this (in common with many more) is one fallen into by clergy and other gentry; but who will say that it becomes any but those who have been brought up in courts, yards, or alleys?

Some years ago a number of children were asked to spend a summer's afternoon with ours, the governesses, deputy mothers, bringing them. For a time all went well. The Queen's forest was visited, tea was had

Digitized by Google

on the lawn, and all seemed happy. One of our little friends was the daughter of a lawyer. He and his were truly excellent persons, and very anxious to give their seven children a good education; and having given their gold to secure the help of one whom they considered peculiarly competent to instruct, they would have been extremely grieved had they even suspected that their children's teacher had any vicious mode of speech. Yet so it was. This governess, this "young lady," seemed very amiable, and most attentive to her pupil, and the child seemed fond of her. They held frequent intercourse. "Will you go to the swing now, my dear?" "No, thank you; I don't want to." "Oh, but you ought to; it was put up for your amusement." "Yes; but I don't wish to." And it went on, and I was sorry, but who could help it? The parents, careful and anxious as they were, could not, for they had not observed it. Does any one ask how that was, when it was evident to others at least? The reply is ready. They fell into the same mistake themselves; therefore no one could with any politeness put the mother on her guard about Miss ——, nor hint that she herself was faulty on the point. Thus this evil speech was handed down to the next generation.

On a late visit to this worthy, and now grown up family, I found my "little girl" well married and in a nice home of her own, with a party of little children about her. Well then, says the "care not" objector, she did marry after all, her prospects in life were not injured, so what did it matter? To which I reply, if it matters not in one thing, let it never matter how we speak.

"Less," for "fewer," is common also. A neighbour of ours (wife of a man who had honourably raised himself from being a day labourer to be master of a lucrative business) called to offer me a drive. "We will go along this road," she said, "because the gates are less." Now they were all regular turnpikes; nor did she mean that they were not all of the same size, and whatever the size the toll was the same; she meant that there were not so many gates to pass through. She used "less" for "fewer:" size for number. Large, less, least; few, fewer, fewest.

Being at the sea-side on a visit, I was urged to go to a certain dissenting place of worship, the minister of which was said to be an eminently pious and clever man. He was absent; gone to preach for a friend; but I remained for the service. The substitute, speaking of our Saviour, said, that though he was always kind to every one, yet he had the most enemies and the less friends of any one ever on earth. My mind turned directly to the grammar of the sentence; and possibly I was not the only one in the congregation whose thoughts were thus diverted. I said to myself, little, less, least: I knew that the preacher did not refer to size, but to number; then why could he not have said fewest? He used less for fewer—size for number.

Returning to the house, I named this to my son and daughter, who had preferred going to a "high church" service in the town. My daughter replied that I had not been worse off than they, for that the clergyman there had read thus (in the second lesson): "for if the hashes of an 'eifer, sprinkling the unclean," &c. Surely this is to be regretted, and, in a college or university man, should be a thing unknown.

Another widely-spread error is the misplacing of the adverb. When is the word "only" in its right place? At this moment I take up a

Digitized by Google

small book on health, medicine, &c., by E. H. Ruddock, M.D. L.R.C.S. L. & E., and at page 49 I read thus: "Houses are only fit to be occupied at night that have been purified, and *dry* by the solar rays in the day time." What can the author mean by "Houses being *only* fit?" What could they be more than fit? Then, again, the past participle purified requires to be followed by the past participle dried, according to Murray's (18th I think) rule of syntax. Conjunctions connect the same moods and tenses of verbs, and cases of nouns and pronouns. If any one should say, "What does it matter? It is easy to see the meaning," I reply, is that any reason why he should express himself so incorrectly, so confusedly? No; he is one of those who, however skilful as a surgeon or a physician, was, like thousands more, never taught to think of his words, or how to place them. Even the lexicographer Walker is very faulty on this word. On the word *record* as a noun he has a note of interest, at the end of which he refers his readers to his "Principles," No. 492, which see. He also quotes three lines from Cowper's "Task" as an authority for the accent being laid on the first syllable: but as the quotation has in it a violation of another rule —see Murray again, Rule 8 of syntax—he would, I think, have done better to choose some other illustration as his authority. The indefinite adjective pronouns—each, every, either—must have verbs, nouns, and pronouns agreeing with them in the *singular* number. The lines from Cowper are these:—

> "But many a crime, deemed innocent on earth,
> Is registered in heaven, and there, no doubt,
> *Have each their* record, with a curse annexed."

I would have it thus: *has each its*.

I take up the "Natural History of Selborne," by the Rev. G. White, and, turning over the leaves to look at the plates, my eyes rest on this note, on page 460: "The squirrel's nest is not only called a drey in Hampshire, but also in other counties: in Suffolk it is called a bey." (Signed, Mitford.) What an involved confused sentence is this! It asserts, according to grammatical arrangement, that the squirrel's nest is not only *called* a drey, but that it really *is* one; yet this is not the writer's meaning evidently (to my mind), as appears in what follows—clumsily enough—"but also in other counties." The information intended to be conveyed seems to be this: "In Hampshire, and in some other counties, the squirrel's nest is called a *drey*: in Suffolk it is called a bey."

A slovenly, idle way of speaking, with lips half closed, is the cause of many errors, leaving out and putting in syllables, just as they happen to fall. Thus, Em'ly, Thor'ld, per'ls, Henery, for Emily, Thorold, perils, Henry; and accumilate, puttickillaly, sofer, umbreller, piller, winder, chaple, modle, for accumulate, particularly, sofa, umbrella, pillar and pillow, window, and chapel, model, with the rest. And there is no reasoning with such speakers: they no more think than care about the manner in which they utter their words; and if a hint be given, ever so kindly and privately, it is most likely laughed off with, "Oh, well! I am understood, and that is all I care for." All such are, in the matter of their use of their own language, "hopeless castaways."

Early dew, Gentile and Jew. Shall we make no difference in sound

Digitized by Google

between these two words? Shall we pronounce dew in its purity, or shall we follow the many, and pronounce it as if spelt Jew? When heard thus, it gives me the notion of an "Ole clo'" man sprawling on the grass. The Jew is on the grass.

A clergyman attended a clerical meeting at which an archdeacon was present. The latter pronounced the word dew as if written or spelt Jew; and who need be surprised at this, or any other slip of the tongue? This learned dignitary was brought up in a nursery, and had learnt, never to forget, from his nurse or the nursery maid, how he was to pronounce the word dew; and, as the archdeacon's parents probably learnt their speech from some other nurse, who most likely was first the nursery maid, and came from the lane or the alley, they were doubtless unconscious of the vicious speech and ways of their son, the future archdeacon; and so the boy grew—like thousands more of our gentry and nobility—knowing but little, and thinking still less, of either the theory or the practice of his "mother tongue."

A remark was made to a clergyman respecting something very wrong that was going on in his parish. He replied that he would immediately institute a very "rigged" inquiry into the matter, spelling the word with two g's and sounding them hard, as in rigging of a ship.

A clergyman, now departed, always read thus, in the "prayer for all conditions of men," "that it may please thee to comfort and relieve them according to their several *ne*cessities," laying great and needless stress on the first syllable. My perverse mind at once went on from *knee*cessities to *leg*cessities and *arm*cessities; nor was I the only one thus moved.

A young lieutenant in the navy has these words printed on his "regulation" telescope, as an order from the Admiralty, to be observed on meeting a vessel: "Ask *from whence* she comes." The printer was not to blame, he having nothing to do but to copy; but he who wrote the direction was in all probability a naval officer of rank, and very possibly one of the lords of the admiralty. But whoever wrote the words, they should have been looked over by some educated man; and very likely they were, and he may have been perfectly satisfied, for it is not likely that the grammar of the subject entered into his thoughts, for what have sailors to do with grammar as long as the commander is able to bring his ship back safe into port? Yet he was a gentleman, and all the officers were gentlemen: they had all been to school to learn at least their mother tongue.

One more of the many errors both in speaking and writing, from the earliest ages, in ancient books on any subject, in the works of our first and best scholars, men or women, is the use of the past participle of a verb for the perfect tense. Thus, in "The Book of Sacred Song," page 17, a "Hymn to the Father:" "Wilt Thou forgive that sin in which I run" (meaning ran, as is clear, from what follows); "Wilt thou forgive the sin through which I do still run, though still I do deplore?" From the very nursery this error is taught, as in the lines: "The mouse run up the clock; the clock struck one, down the mouse run," &c. In this instance the grammar is sacrificed to the rhyme; but the preceding example had not even that excuse. He sung a song; a song was sang; he begun to read; he drunk some water, and when the water was all drank he took to the wine. Examples might be multiplied; and any one

Digitized by Google

who has read through a grammar of his own language with thought and care, and some previous knowledge of its rules, will surely see that all the above sentences are wrong.

Tenses are often jumbled together, thus: I had intended to have done it. It had been my intention to have written to you again last week. I have looked in your pamphlet, says a scholar. Let us study brevity where the shorter word will do as well; why not begin as well as commence, and forgive as well as pardon? I should rather say, "Let me help you," than "permit" or "allow me to assist you." A lamp is not lit, it is lighted. People is not the plural of person: one person, two persons, or fifty persons, or five hundred persons were in a large room, and *each* one signed *his* name. A friend wrote me thus: "We are going in our new house to day." She meant into. A master in a public school named something to me which he called a great *de*fect; he was the son of a beneficed clergyman.

Let us keep words to their primary and natural sense if possible. We buy a pair of gloves, not "invest" in a pair. A gentleman (by profession) greeted me in a room with, "Oh! I am not fit to shake hands with you, for I have been out boating and am awfully dirty." I said, "Yes; I see you are splashed; but I can see nothing awful in that, and you should not say so." A young girl spoke to me of a "jolly row" she had had; was it becoming or even feminine? I like not the expression, a "fast" girl; let her be called, as is meant, a bold girl. "Slow," "high," "low," "broad," and many more, are now wrenched from their right application, and tacked on to things quite different. It is slang; bad enough in men, *very* offensive indeed in "gentle" woman.

To want. I object to the use of this verb as a synonym of to need, and to lack, and—in practice—would have it restricted thus: to want, to wish for, to desire to have; to need, to require.

To lack: to be deficient in; thus: our neighbours across the channel are precise on the point, and have a verb for each separate idea. So have we, but in practice the distinction is lost.

I want some water—Je désire de l'eau. In other words, I wish for some water. I want some shoes—Il me faut des souliers. In other words, I require some shoes. I want one shilling of the sum; or, I am one shilling short of the sum; or, I lack a shilling: Il me manque un schellin. Again, we say, Where did you sleep last night? meaning, Where did you pass the night, and did you sleep? They say, Où avez-vous couché; hier-au-soir? et avez-vous dormi? The first "want" is desire; the second "want" is necessity; the third "want" is deficiency. "Please, mother, I want another piece of cake." "No," replies the prudent but ungrammatical mother; "you do not; you have had three pieces." "Yes; but indeed, mother, I do want a bit more." And, to my thinking, the child was right: he wished for more.

Walker, in his pronouncing dictionary (ed. 1835) has this note on the word asparagus: "Such words as the vulgar do not know how to spell, and which convey to them no definite idea, are often changed by them into others which they *do think* they can spell and which *do* convey to them a definite idea. The word asparagus is an instance of this, and its corruption into sparrowgrass is so general that asparagus has an air of stiffness and pedantry." I cannot agree with him in the last sentence;

Digitized by Google

but if it is so, then is it not time for the better taught to use their utmost efforts to preserve their language in its purity, or to restore it where lost? The vulgar, as he designates the cottagers and labourers, are not capable of doing this. In their lips, and with their pens, the mother tongue is marred, and it is for the well-educated or more carefully brought up classes to rescue it by their own example, and by encouraging others to do so too. The gentlefolk and the nobles of our country must be the preservers of the purity of our language, not the hedgers and ditchers.

I was lately passing through a churchyard, and, stopping a moment to observe two boys filling in a new grave, a man near me, also looking on, observed: "Ah, ma'am, that is a little girl as lays there: she died of a viper's dance." "Poor little child," I said, "she must have suffered much; but her body is now at rest." Had a child been with me I should have explained to him (or to her) the meaning and spelling of St. Vitus' dance.

"H." Instances of the misuse of this letter are as numerous as they are sad and distressing, or ludicrous and absurd. Visiting the family of a baronet in London, I went with the son to a church filled with fashionable persons; and, coming out, I said to the young man, "Why how can *you* bear to attend a church where the clergyman confuses all the H's?" The reply was: "Why, that is Dr. C. He is the first Hebrew scholar in the world." This reply showed me that, though he himself was not faulty on that point, yet he attached very little importance to it, and I saw also that a deep knowledge of the learned languages was no guarantee for a practical acquaintance with the mother tongue.

Neither is rank any security; for, naming this incident to a most estimable and learned friend—an M.P. too—he replied: "Why, there is our friend, Sir ——; he never by any chance puts in an H properly." Yet this gentleman (friend) was an LL.D. of Oxford, and at that very time held a post under government requiring a thorough knowledge and practice of his own tongue.

A man, with this unfortunate habit, was asked how "saloon" was spelt; the answer was: a hess, a hay, a hell, two hoes, and a hen; all the H's being very distinctly sounded.

"'ark! the 'unter's 'oller 'orn" is an unfortunate sentence in the lips of village children. It was an early serenade to a lady at the rectory. We dined at the house of a rich man, and everything was suitable and handsome except the speech of the master. Boiled turkey and ham having been removed to make way for roast beef at his end of the table, he called the servant and reproved him for not also having changed the carving knife, adding that he "did not like to cut beef with an 'ammy knife." The same worthy man, being churchwarden, called on the rector of the parish to express his fear that the latter had felt the church cold; he begged that he would have no scruple, but order it to be 'eated at any time. He said, "I could 'eat the whole building with ease in a quarter of an hour." A feat indeed! Rather less surprising, but still curious, was the offer of our servant to 'eat the oven at any time in a few minutes, if I would like any little 'ot cakes baked for breakfast. But this last was a servant girl, and the instance before was a man who had worked in his shirt sleeves. The next, however, was unjustifiable altogether. He, and his wife, and "Master" Carolus, as they called the boy of seven years, had "tea" with us; and after eating very heartily

Digitized by Google

of the toast, &c., I said: "Pray take another piece; more will be brought in directly." "Thank you; but I will wait for the little 'otter." This man had been at college, Cambridge I think, and had been taught by scholars; but not how to speak his own language properly.

The distributive adjective pronouns, each, every, and either, are greatly misused by most persons, both in speaking and writing. No rank, no profession, is clear from this error, and a curious fact is, that, while in all the writings of the same author we might expect to find the same errors, yet this is by no means certain, and it is much more likely, that he (or she) will be right in page 1 and wrong in page 2; and so on through the book with respect to, not this word alone, but to every other error which the author is in the habit of making. The Rev. E. B. is notorious for this ungrammatical fickleness: he is nine times wrong, once right, two or three times right, four or five times wrong. He, like all other writers, myself included, I fear, has his own peculiar set of errors, and, as a matter of course, he adheres to them. "Habit is second nature."

Here, for the present, my remarks on the use and abuse of the mother tongue shall end. May they be practically useful to all who shall read them, or to at least a few, or even to one. We hear said to the young, "If you are a gentleman (or lady), and wish to be thought one, act like one." Good advice; to which may it not be added with equal propriety and earnestness, speak like one, read like one, write like one, be one in all things. Let us try to have no exceptions tacked on to our names, a *clever* man, *but*—; a good woman, *but*—. Faulty we shall be to the end of our days, but gentlefolk should at least try to improve themselves, and others when and where they can; but chiefly themselves: let each one mend one. In spite of all difficulties arising from any cause, early wrong training, or neglect, let each one do what he (or she) can. We differ studiously in dress and manners, and carefully instill into the minds of our children the feeling that we should differ from those whom we call "the vulgar," the common people. Let us be equally careful and watchful over them in this far more important point. We very properly cultivate refinement in other things, as in delicate attention to the person —we object to any failure in that—not to enter further into minutiæ; then let us be as particular in our speech. As to others, we know that there is a fit time and circumstance for the best effort if we wish it to succeed. I would not advocate "finding fault" indiscriminately, nor with any one, unless alone with him; nor with our elders, nor in an unkind, ungenial, still less in a scornful, ungracious manner; but, watching for an opportunity of doing good and not harm, may we seek to win our way to the hearts of all with whom we have any intercourse, and use it as wisely, prudently, and kindly as we can; seeking their good,—not our own exaltation, as though our feeling were, "I am wiser than you." Wisdom will die with me.

To the English *gentry* then, to the English *nobility*, even to the highest rank, to ladies, and to gentlemen, to the ancient castle and the modern hall; not to the mechanic, nor to the artisan, still less to the lower ranks, I dedicate this effort in behalf of our mother tongue. Should any reader discover errors of any sort, and be so kind as to name them to the writer, he will do good service, and shall have her best thanks.

Ashchurch Rectory, Tewkesbury. ANN SMITH WARLEIGH.

Digitized by Google

# NOTE ON THE TERMS HELL, SCHÊOL, AND HADES.

AT the present time, when so much attention is bestowed on the belief connected with the names Hell, Schêol, and Hades, in consequence of the writings of Canon Farrar and others, the following etymological remarks may be of interest to the readers of the RAINBOW.

I. *Hell.* This word is derived from Hel, "darkness," the Sanskrit Kal-i, "the Black," which, in the Norse religious mythology, was the goddess of death, who was said to dwell in Hel-hemir, "the home of Hel," a place of cold and polar underworld. Hence the Anglo-Saxon or old English *Hel-an*, "to cover over;" whence the modern *hell*, "the unseen and covered place" (Bishop Horsley, *Sermon* xx). So Verstigan,—"Helt hath like apt appellation [i.e. as heaven] as being *helled* over, that is to say, hidden or covered" (*Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*, cap. vii. 1634). There is no connection between the word and heat, but the contrary. Compare the Homeric Nekyomanteia or "abode-of-the-dead." (Odys. xi.)

II. *Scheol.* "The hollow covered place;" akin to *schel*, "hollow of the hand," the outside of the world being regarded as a somewhat bent hand, the covered inside being Schêol, the Assyrian "land of the earth," hell, hole; a similar bending above the earth is heaven. Greek, *koilos*, Latin *cœlum*, "the hollow," the upper vault. Schêol is thus an exact equivalent of hell, the "hollow covered place" producing "darkness." The names may *possibly* have sprung from the same archaic root, ere the separation of Aryan and Semite. The letters unite: ScHEoLL. I am not aware that in the Old Testament Schêol is represented as being connected with either heat or physical pain. The mind is spoken of as being pained at the thought of going there, i.e., of dying; e.g., "The cords of Schêol" (Ps. xviii. 5); "the distresses of Schêol" (ibid. cxvi. 3).

III. *Hades.* Usually supposed to signify "the unseen (state)," from *a*, neg. and *eido*, "to see." But I think, with the late Fox Talbot, that the term, like many other Greek words, is derived from the Kaldeo-Assyrian language, of which Hebrew is a variant dialect, and is the Assyrian *edi*, Hebrew *ed*, "duration of period." Schêol, the underworld, is called in Assyrian *Bit edi*, "the house of eternity." *Bit* = Hebrew *Beth*; e.g., *Beth-el*, "House of El," or God.

So the Greek term Erebos, applied to the darkness of the underworld and placed by Homer in the west, is derived from the Assyrian *eribu*, "to set," as the sun; and similarly Europe is *Ereb*, "the west," or sun-set side of the world, whilst the *Araôs* are the dwellers in western Asia.

Again, the river Acheron, in Greek mythology one of the streams of the underworld, and connected with the western darkness, is merely the Assyrian *Akharru*, Hebrew *Akharai*, "the west," literally "That-which-is-behind;" i.e., when a man stands facing Qedem, "the east," which correspondingly signifies literally "That-which-is-before."

Schêol is certainly not, as some moderns have thought, merely the grave, in which dead bodies are placed; and the teaching of both Testaments, in accordance with the almost universal opinion of mankind in all ages, plainly sets forth the continued conscious existence of the soul after death. In the fine words of an Egyptian Litany, "He who is intelligent upon the earth, he also is intelligent after his death."

ROBT. BROWN, Jun.

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

JULY, 1878.

## "THE MUTUAL SOCIETY, HELP, AND COMFORT" OF CHRISTIAN PEOPLE.

### A MEMENTO.

WE might hope that the writings of our dear departed friend, and "companion in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ," Henry Dunn, might be more extensively known, now that he has been taken from us than when he was spared to us. And yet in this hope—a very reasonable one—we may be disappointed, and may have to content ourselves instead, with a certain temper of mind, and a particular judgment as to divers things divine begotten by these works, more widely extended than the circle of such as are acquainted with them; a compensation befalling the labours of many who have been entitled to a noble reward. Very seldom, if ever, do we meet with direct quotations from Mr. Dunn's volumes. There may be reasons we can think of for this. He was what is called a "lay theologian;" albeit, some of the greatest theologians have been laymen. He was not, as his friend William Maude suggests, in the technical sense, a scholar, though scholarly. No doubt, too, the peculiarity of his views on ecclesiastical subjects, more pronounced of later years, may have prejudiced many against his treatment, leaving scarcely aught to be desired, of topics eschatological which he had made specially his own. But we need not scruple to affirm, that unless the church of God should largely abandon the worldly methods adopted by her in doing her work, and the worldly standards whereby she estimates the success of her work, when done,—in other words, unless she will consent to pay less respect than she at present does, to "the god Majority," it will be impossible to resist divers of the conclusions at which he has arrived concerning her, and of that which awaits her in the latter day.

In a conversation which the writer had with Mr. Dunn a few



Digitized by Google

years ago, the latter suddenly directed his remarks to the passage in St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, the fourth chapter, the sixteenth verse, where the apostle speaks of "the whole body of Christ fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, making increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." He was led to lay much stress upon that which, not the whole body only, but which "every joint" ought to supply, in order to this end. Unquestionably, any idea we should be justified in forming of a church, no very high idea, but even a low one, would be that it is an institution intended like that of the institute of marriage, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, for "the mutual society, help, and comfort" of such as enter into its fellowship. The church, even from a natural point of view, ought to be, to adopt the title of one of Dr. Newman's remarkable sermons, "a home for the lonely." Should we, however, go too far, were we to say, that a multitude of humble, unostentatious, reflective members of the church, are left to feel the loneliness of their estate all but as keenly as if they did not belong to the church? They go not, or are not welcomed into, what is called "general society," and the church has no society for them, to meet their mental and moral needs. Our friend went on to ask me, what my experience had been in this matter? what amount of benefit I had derived from church fellowship? what I was able to testify as to what the various joints supplied to the increase of the body? what help or support I had met with from any single joint? I could but reply, that he to whom I was speaking, was an exception that proved the rule: for he had been "a succourer of many, and of myself also." Would that a larger number held him in the same esteem, as a spiritual benefactor, as I do, and some others to whom I have introduced his writings! But taking "the whole body" into account, I am sorrowfully obliged to confess the inference to be the one intimated by his interrogations. As to the communion to which I belong, after a ministerial experience among all classes, from the highest to the lowest, and an extensive acquaintance with brethen in the ministry, of nearly forty years, I am constrained to say, what Professor Martineau does of that to which he belongs, "I am conscious that my deepest obligations, as a learner from others, are, in almost every department, to writers out of my own creed." Every one, indeed, more or less, has to acknowledge his obligations to the published works of many whom he may never see in the flesh, as well as to the authors whom he knows; but to neither of these can the doctor of the Gentiles have referred, in speaking of that which "every joint supplieth," or ought to supply, "unto the edifying of the body in love."

In intruding further upon your space, I would particularise two respects in which, in relation to "the edifying of the body of Christ" on the part of individual members, if we be in no worse

Digitized by Google

condition than formerly, (not forgetting there are so many more of us,) I fear it cannot be said we are in a better. Firstly, in respect of correspondence of a religious character. "Letter-writing," it has been said, "is a lost art." With the cheapening of postage, though one might suppose it would have been the reverse, has come the abbreviation of epistles. How comparatively few letters in the present day contain sentences worthy of being stored in the memory! How few letters do we transmit, or receive, worthy of being preserved! Between how many excellent people may a letter not have passed for years beyond those of the most perfunctory, business-like kind! Yet, nothing would appear to be easier than for a thoughtful, spiritually-minded person, in any letter, brief, ordinary though it may be, to indite some paragraph, where it might not be unnecessarily or injudiciously brought in, which might convey a salutary impression, or be as "a nail fastened in a sure place." How many "joints" might aid "the edifying the body" in this way! Not a few are there who are dilatory in answering letters which deserve or require an answer, or who leave letters, as it is said, to answer themselves. A letter, it should be remembered, is written speech, and ought to be acknowledged as promptly as possible. "How dare I," asks Emerson, "read Washington's campaigns when I have not answered the letters of my own correspondents?" It may be said, we can see each other oftener than we were wont to do in times gone by, therefore need not write so often; but he who neglects to answer letters gives but little evidence of a desire to see the writers. Much of our default in this particular, arises, without doubt, from that excessive activity of the age, in the Church as well as in the world, against which Henry Dunn has remonstrated. Teachers and preachers in these times are "servants of all work;" work, much of it of a semi-secular kind, which might fairly be transferred to others, and some of it which, were it omitted altogether, the people's spiritual estate would be little impaired by the omission. Alas! the many disciples who are apt to drop off when external pressure is relaxed! yet we persist in dealing with numbers as the test of success.

Secondly, in respect of religious conversation. How little of direct conversation on religious subjects there comparatively is among us; and as little, peradventure, of conversation which is indirect, conversation taking its tone from such subjects. How few like to come to close quarters upon all-important questions, and "the deep things of God!" How common-place, how disappointing is our ordinary converse! How often is an approach to serious argument an inducement to change the topic! And as with the ministers of Christ among themselves, so with their attitude towards the people of Christ. The people cannot but notice how reticent the clergy are, in their company, upon topics which may be to them the occasion of "deep searchings of heart;" causing them by such reticence to infer that there are things in the



Digitized by Google

background which their professional teachers will not face, and that, possibly, they are making statements in the pulpit which they might not adhere to in the parlour. And thus does it come to pass that there is much latent incredulity coupled with the outwardly patient endurance of homiletics. "Then they that feared the Lord," writes the last of the prophets of the synagogue, "spake often one to another; and the Lord hearkened, and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before Him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon His name. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up My jewels." Why should there be so few of these jewels of speech in the Church?

Nevertheless, what the many are not, and never may be, that the few are, and ever have been. All things, especially as the end draweth nigh, as the friend in whose remembrance I have so far written has so clearly shown, point, under this dispensation, to a gathering out, not to an universal gathering in, to an election, not for the benefit of the elect, but for the ultimate enriching of the world. A chosen seed, not to the reprobation of the race to which they belong, but for the well-being of that race in the future. A seed which the church that now is may disuse so far as it dare, but which is preserved for greater usefulness, under God, in the divine kingdom, in the age to come, when lower forms of usefulness shall have perished that forms of higher usefulness may remain.

A. B. EVANS, D.D.

---

## MAN IN DEATH UNCONSCIOUS.

IN approaching the New Testament on this subject we must bring along with us the fact that inspired men, speaking by the Spirit under the previous dispensation, have distinctly announced death to be a state where there is "no knowledge," and where men "praise not the Lord." Hence, no *inferences* from the language of the inspired men of the Christian dispensation can be permitted to reverse the *positive* declarations of the Old Testament writers. If no positive testimony appears affirming the living, conscious state of dead men in the New Testament, we have a right to the conclusion that no such doctrine is taught there. But we shall find on examination, very likely, that the inspired Jews of the Christian dispensation do not contradict the inspired Jews of the previous one. Both harmonise in the fact of a future life by a resurrection or a re-living from the dead.

A few facts of New Testament history may first be examined which go to confirm the idea that life after death is only by a resurrection from the dead.

Digitized by Google

I. *The revival of dead persons by our Lord and his Apostles.*

On this subject, it may be remarked, that in no case was there any language used indicating that the essential being of the dead was in any other place than what appeared obvious to the actors and to beholders of these revivals. In other words, There was no calling of "souls" from heaven or from above to re-enter the bodies of the dead: there is no such language employed that indicated a surviving entity—called *soul*—must return to re-inhabit the body before it could live again. When Jesus raised to life the daughter of Jairus, a ruler of the synagogue (Mark v. 22-43), he "entered in where the damsel was lying" and took her "by the hand, and said unto her, Damsel, I say unto thee, Arise."

The *personality*—the damsel herself—was there. It was to her who was "lying" before them, that was *the* damsel, to whom Jesus spake, and not to an entity, or being invisible, in some other state or place.

So likewise (Luke vii. 11-15) as Jesus was going into the city of Nain he met a funeral train: the only son of a widow was dead, and being carried forth to his burial. Jesus came near and touched the bier, and they who bare the dead man made a halt. What now occurred? Simply, Jesus addressing the dead man, said, "Young man, I say unto thee, Arise." What follows? "And he that was dead sat up and began to speak." All the circumstances and the language forbid the idea that a disembodied soul, which had gone to heaven at death, was called back to re-enter the body. It was the dead man, borne upon the bier, to whom Jesus spake, and whom he called "Young man," and bade him "arise," and who immediately "sat up and began to speak."

How far the whole transaction is removed from the idea of a living soul being recalled from some distant world on this occasion! There is not one circumstance or sign—one look, prayer, or command, that gives any indication of the absence of any part of this man. He is there, really, personally; and at Jesus' voice awakes from the death-*sleep* that had come over him; his manhood resumes its living existence, which it had not till Jesus spake in his ears.

The case of Lazarus (John xi.) may next be noticed. "Lazarus is dead," said Jesus. This death he calls *sleep*. Before our Lord came to the grave, he asks, "Where have ye laid *him?*"—thus recognising the fact that the *personality* of Lazarus was there. When he came to the grave, he utters not a word calculated to lead any one to suppose Lazarus was anywhere else than there. No calling upon an invisible entity to return and re-inhabit "the body!" But looking into the grave, "He cried with a *loud voice*, LAZARUS, COME FORTH." Did Jesus call him from where he was not? But he did call him from the grave; then Lazarus was there. To say, "his body was there, but his soul had gone to heaven," is to assume the whole question, not only without any evidence, but against the clearest evidence of the falsity of such

Digitized by Google

a position. *Lazarus* was dead: *Lazarus* was laid in the grave; and from the grave Jesus bade *Lazarus* come forth, and he did come. The whole transaction is adverse to the idea of the duality of man—one entity of whom does not die—does not go into the grave, but in conscious living existence departs to some far of sphere, in common language, "above the stars."

The case of the female disciple, named Tabitha, or Dorcas, who was dead, and restored to life by Peter (Acts ix. 39-41), is another example where the evidence is against the idea of the personality being found anywhere except in "the body" *alone*. After Peter had prayed, "Turning to the body, he said, *Tabitha*, arise; and *she* opened her eyes, and when she saw Peter she sat up," &c. Peter calls "the body," Tabitha; showing that the personality was there, and not somewhere else. "He presented her *alive*" to the saints and widows present. *She*—Tabitha herself—had been dead—now she is alive. No hint—no intimation that a separate, living entity had been recalled from heaven, or from any other state or place. Her personality was dead, but now is restored to life. Such an idea as a double entity is not found in the scene.

2. *The Death, and Re-living of Jesus.*

The death and revival of our Lord Jesus Christ himself will be found, on examination, equally adverse to the idea of the survival of his soul in conscious existence when dead. It will be no part of my inquiry now what his *soul* was. That soul was made an "offering for sin" (Isa. liii. 10); *it* was "poured out unto death" (verse 12). In agreement with this, the Saviour said to his disciples—"My soul is exceeding sorrowful, *even unto death*." (Matt. xxvi. 38.) His soul descended into *sheol* (Psa. xvi. 10), and "in sheol there is no knowledge." Paul declares "Christ died." He uses no such language as modern theology employs, such as—"separation of soul and body," to denote the death of Christ. He speaks not of his soul as departing to heaven when he died, but—"CHRIST DIED:" the personality died. That his death was a reality, and not a mere separation of a living soul from the body, must be evident, from the fact that the death is spoken of the soul, and our Lord's own testimony, three days after his death occurred—"*I* am not yet ascended to my Father." (John xx. 17.) Here is the personality that was dead, embracing his entire manhood, and whom God had raised up from the dead, according to the prophecy—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in *sheol*"—in the state of death. Furthermore, Jesus said to John, when he appeared to him on the Isle of Patmos—"I am he that liveth: and *was* dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore, amen; and have the keys of hades and of death." (Rev. i. 18.)

There was no manifestation of the Christ, either spiritually or otherwise, while he was dead: and without a re-living from the dead, he himself is perished, and with him all the race of Adam. Hence, upon his revival into life—or resurrection from the dead—

Digitized by Google

depended all the hope for a dying race, for a life to come. This view gives a tremendous importance to the resurrection of the dead; just such an importance as the Scriptures attach to it; and such as the advocates of the common theory—of the living survival of the soul—never did, and never can see or feel. "CHRIST DIED"—"GOD raised HIM from the dead"—Knowing that CHRIST being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over HIM."

Such testimony shows, in an unmistakable manner, that the personality of Christ actually died; was unconscious in sheol, in hades. His life-giving power to his followers all depended on the fact of his revival from the dead: so that, "if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain: ye are yet in your sins: then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are PERISHED." (1 Cor. xv. 17, 18.) There is no future life for any man, if Christ is not restored from death. Such is the clear testimony of the New Testament: all turns on the fact, whether Christ is alive: but he is not alive unless God raised him up from the dead; hence there was no living survivance of his soul in death.

3. *Our Lord and the Sadducees.*

The discourse of our Lord with the Sadducees is further proof that dead men are unconscious, and that a future life depends on the resurrection, or re-living from the dead.

I would ask very especial attention to that part of the Evangelical history which records the interview of our Lord with the Sadducees. (Luke xx.) This sect was evidently one of very great consideration among the Jews, since, notwithstanding the very serious errors which they professed, they were sufficiently numerous and influential to share the dignities of office with their rival countrymen, the Pharisees. With both these sects Christ was at issue; and, therefore, his opposition to the one is not to be regarded as identifying him with the other. The Sadducees were very prominently opposed by the teaching of Christ, the grand theme of whose ministry was resurrection from the dead, a doctrine which this sect especially repudiated. The success of our Lord's mission as a teacher was, therefore, so much loss of influence to them; and in this respect, gain to that of the Pharisees. Under these circumstances they adventured to publicly confront him, and imagined that they should successfully perplex him, by instancing, what they supposed, an insuperable difficulty in the way of the doctrine in question.

It is not undeserving our notice that no allusion is made by the Sadducees to a state intermediate between death and the resurrection, to which their objection would also have been applicable; but they proceed from the time of the *death* of the woman of seven husbands to that of the *resurrection*. It would seem that, if our Lord had taught the doctrine of the conscious disembodied soul existing in a state intermediate between death and the resurrection,

Digitized by Google

these philosophico-religious controvertists would scarcely have travelled over this long interval to a future event; it would have been more to their purpose to have inquired, "What relation does this woman sustain to her seven husbands *now?*" There would have been no greater absurdity in this question than that which they proposed, since, if it be affirmed that the soul is the human personality, capable of a separate existence, then relationships of some kind might be presumed to obtain in the intermediate state, as likely as in the resurrection. It would have answered their end equally well, to have asked the general question, "What relation does she now sustain to these husbands?" as the more specific one, "Whose *wife* will she be in the resurrection?" This form of the question, indeed, would have been the more useful, because it would have embraced the two obnoxious articles of the Pharisaic creed, and like a two-edged sword have cut both ways at once. The Sadducees not only denied the resurrection but the Pharisaic philosophy of the existence of separate souls. Their silence with respect to this subject of disembodied existence, in an intermediate state, makes it highly probable that, whatever the Pharisees may have taught, Christ's ministry comprehended no such doctrine. Their inquiry is only in reference to the resurrection—they ask—"Therefore, *in the resurrection* whose wife of them is she?"

And Christ's reply, although it does not formally contradict the popular doctrine of the conscious intermediate state, yet certainly seems to imply that there is no such state. "The children of this world," he says, "marry, and are given in marriage: but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Here are but two states spoken of—"the children of *this* world," and "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that* world." Not the remotest allusion is made to any other state in which man exists. On the contrary, it is affirmed of them "which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, neither can they die any more." It might be plausibly replied that our Lord used this word "die" in allusion to the event of death, the mere experience of dying; but it seems more natural, and more in harmony with the context to suppose that he meant by it the state of death, the whole period between dying to "this world," and arising in "that world" of which he had previously been speaking. And the very phrases by which the redeemed are designated, seem to exclude any intermediate state of conscious existence between death and the resurrection. They are called in reference to their two states, "the children of this world," and "the children of the resurrection."

But further, having exhibited to them the futility of their supposed unanswerable argument against the doctrine in question, and placed its possibility before them by the announcement that the

Digitized by Google

new condition of the future life will dispense with many of the relations and circumstances of the present, he proceeds to appeal to their sacred books, and their acknowledged authority, Moses, in vindication of the doctrine of resurrection from the dead. "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead but of the living, for all live unto him." This allusion to the writings of Moses, let it be carefully observed, is for this especial purpose—to prove to the Sadducees *the certainty* of the resurrection. Its purpose is thus formally announced by Christ—"Now that the dead are" [*will be*] "raised."

Obviously the future, according to a common idiom of language, is here put in the present tense. We inquire, how does this appeal to the words of Moses prove the disputed doctrine? Moses called the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. But Abraham and Isaac and Jacob are *dead!* Is God the God of the dead? Said Christ, "He is *not* a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him." Does this last statement, "all live unto him," mean, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were actually alive as disembodied spirits? If so, how does it prove the point in debate? Christ is arguing with the object of proving the certainty of the resurrection—"Now that the dead are raised," is the position which he undertakes to prove. Such an interpretation of his words, makes our Lord's argument pointless; it then contains no proof "that the dead are raised." But the argument is logical, and the proof triumphant. As if our Lord had said—True, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob *are dead*, but their death is only *temporary*, they will *live again*; this brief cessation of their existence is nothing to him "who calls those things which be not as though they were." All live unto God whom he designs *shall* live, though they live not *now*. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, although dead, yet live in God's affections and purposes; and at the appointed time they shall live in his actual presence. God would not be called "the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob," were they *dead for ever*, as you Sadducees believe; "for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living." Jesus Christ, as "the Resurrection and the Life" promised—and the Patriarchs are interested in that promise—"Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall not die for ever;" he shall die for a time, but not for ever; he shall rise again. Because, therefore, the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, will live again at the resurrection of the just, God, the "God of the living," is appropriately called, by Moses, their God. The proof of resurrection from the dead is complete and irresistible. The point to be proved, "*Now that the dead are raised*," is triumphantly reached. "Then certain of the Scribes answering said, Master, thou hast well said."

This grand argument, however, involves much more than is at

Digitized by Google

first apparent. It affirms, by implication, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are *dead:* that they are *not now* in possession of conscious life. Our Lord's argument demands this supposition; it is an essential step upon which he rises to his consummate proof of the resurrection of the dead. Where, then, is the Great Teacher's recognition of the doctrine of the disembodied spirit, and the intermediate state of consciousness of the dead? This one instruction, the more valuable on account of its argumentative form, and proceeding from him who has "the keys of hades and of death," is sufficient alone to scare away the human traditions against which I contend. – *Bible Examiner.*

---

# "THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY COME TO PASS."

REVELATION i. 1.

No. VI.

*(Continued from June.)*

THIS period of wonders foretold by the Apostle in 2 Thess. i. and ii. we take to be the same shown to Daniel as *a time and times, and the dividing of time*, wherein shall arise "a little horn having eyes as a man, and a mouth speaking great things against the Most High, and he shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws, and they shall be given into his hand. But the judgment shall sit and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it unto the end." (Dan. vii. 25, 26.) This same power we find described in Rev. xiii. as a beast rising up out of the *sea*, to whom is given a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies, and power is given unto him to continue *forty and two months*, and to make war with the saints, and to overcome them. For another beast is seen coming up out of the *earth*, having horns like a lamb, but speaking as a dragon, exercising all the power of the first beast, and doing still greater wonders, causing fire to come down from heaven and working miracles whereby to impose upon his worshippers. The first beast we take to be a political power, an infidel power, utterly atheistic and materialistic—unless, indeed, spiritualistic—ignoring revelation and God altogether. But this second beast we regard as an ecclesiastical power that shall act in concert with, and further the ends of the first beast, by causing all both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads, and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. Here shall be seen the patience of the saints, they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Herein we find the

Digitized by Google

*woman* of the previous chapter fleeing into the wilderness where she hath a place prepared of God that they should feed her there *a thousand two hundred and threescore days*, "and to her are given two wings of a great eagle that she might fly into the wilderness into her place where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time from the face of the serpent, the great dragon," called the Devil and Satan. The dragon pursues her a while, but the earth is compassionate, opens its mouth, and swallows the flood designed to overwhelm her; yet such is his wrath that he goes to "make war with the remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus." (Rev. xii. 17.)

What *all* this figurative language is intended to convey it is impossible to foresee, but to us it seems clear, that from the seat of the beast—wherever that may be—those who are left behind when the church is caught away, the foolish virgins, the remnant of *her* seed who gave birth to the Man-child, will be driven by persecution to some remote part, and that in these fires of persecution, a remnant shall prove faithful in resisting the mark of the beast, and at the end of his reign he found *overcomers*.

But let us consider this beast that John saw rising out of the sea; and without indulging too much our fancy, may we not see in its likeness to a leopard with spots many, some possible allusion to the German empire with its states many? in its likeness to a bear, some possible allusion to the great northern power of Russia? and in its likeness to a lion, similar allusion to Great Britain, France, and Ireland, formerly one kingdom?—three great powers out of whom shall mainly arise an International League uniting under one head the several factions known by the names of Socialism, Nihilism, Communism, Trades-Unionism, and Fenianism, who, when their time shall come, and with it *The Man*, shall confederate against all governments, called "the powers that be, ordained of God," and by force or by fraud, chiefly we apprehend by intimidation, shall obtain such control and influence as shall cause men in astonishment to exclaim, Who is like The Man, our Man? (called in the Scriptures of truth, a wild beast). Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him? Appropriate to our subject have been some thoughts that have found expression in the latest deliverance from the chair of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, from which we cannot forbear quoting one passage. "In England, the principles which the French Revolution brought to the front—they were really born in England—have been working slowly through the solid order of our social system, and in these days we are feeling, I think, their full impert, with remarkable, not to say startling result. If the movement had been clearly articulate, I doubt if it could have uttered its proclamation more plainly than in the phrase which Professor Clifford has formulated for us, *The kingdom of man is at hand*. The kingdom of man is at hand! I confess that I was glad when I saw the words;

Digitized by Google

glad that since the idea is so widely working, it should be formulated so sharply, and in a shape which places it in such clear antagonism to the Gospel proclamation; 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.' Mr. Clifford has at any rate the courage of his convictions, and, little meaning it, has done us essential service. The bold bald atheism which he has professed, and the bare dry desert which his materialism makes of life, have startled and shocked not a few." ("Our Theology," pp. 15 and 16, by J. Baldwin Brown.)

Whether or not Napoleon Bonaparte was the one head "as it were wounded unto death, whose deadly wound became healed" (Rev. xiii. 3), we neither presume to say or think conclusively, but the same power that he represented, we expect to see rise up out of the sea of revolution, clamouring again for liberty, equality, fraternity, and receiving power from the dragon, then cast out into the earth (Rev. xii. 9; xiii. 2), his success will become so rapid and so complete, that all the world shall wonder after the beast, and "all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." (Rev. xiii. 8.)

But we must now take note of "the two witnesses" foreshown in Rev. xi. For it would seem that at the commencement of the period, we have been considering *two* shall arise, like unto Moses in their power to smite the earth with plagues as often as they will, and, like unto Elijah in their power to shut heaven that it rain not in the days of their prophecy. And with the promise in Malachi, "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord," we have no difficulty in identifying their appearance as its fulfilment. And when we consider Rev. xi. 4, in relation to them as a quotation from Zech. iv. 14, in connection too with the further promise in Malachi concerning Elijah, "He shall turn (or as we understand it, *seek to turn*) the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers" (insubordination having become the rule of social life), we cannot help thinking that the primary work of these two witnesses will be, for a brief while, testimony to a long-suffering God, not willing *even then* that all should perish in the impending judgments. But, rejecting this last testimony, and seeking to slay the witnesses, his long-suffering *shall* have an end, and he will through them, fulfil his threat: "I will come and smite the earth with a curse." "For, behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." (Mal. iv. 1.) Many have been the conjectures of commentators as to who these two witnesses should be, some even suggesting that Enoch and Elijah—having been translated that they should not see death—shall appear on earth again

Digitized by Google

as men in the flesh, to receive eventually the crown of martyrdom. With such interpretation, however, we have no sympathy. That they will be men in the flesh we have no doubt; that they will be two exceptionally choice spirits, having had their training in common with all the children of men "among the inhabitants of Gilead" somewhere, or at "the back side of some desert;" neither do we doubt that when the church was caught away, they were left to fulfil their life-work as anointed ones, standing by (or before) the God of the earth. Endowed with supernatural powers, they shall not flee before their enemies as do the remnant of the woman's seed. (Rev. xii. 14.) "For if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies." This may be but figurative language, showing that by a word they shall be able to strike dead their enemies as Annas and Sapphira were smitten to death by the word of Peter. But, "when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them, and their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified." How much of fact and how much of figure here also we have, the day must declare; but wherever the Antichrist shall have his metropolis, there, we see no reason why so explicit a statement might not have a nearly literal fulfilment. Sodom and Egypt are doubtless typical names for apostasy and captivity; and if by this time Jerusalem shall have been rebuilt as the capital of Palestine, and become the seat of the beast, it will be *literally* "where also our Lord was crucified."

But not long do the enemies triumph over these two witnesses, for "after three days and an half, the spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet; and they heard a great voice from heaven, saying unto them, Come up hither; and they ascended up to heaven in a cloud, and their enemies beheld them." This resurrection to life, and rapture of these two witnesses, leads us to think, if not to conclude, that at the same time there will be a second resurrection of *more* if not *all* the righteous dead, and a second rapture too of all that are alive and remain as overcomers of the beast, his image, his name, and the number of his name. Many, doubtless, will have been persecuted to death under the reign of the beast, who will thus soon be raised again, while some may yet remain alive as overcomers, and these must be changed and caught up together with the two witnesses to join the Lord and his bride in the air, for the two witnesses and the overcomers of the beast, must form part of that bride, and so be called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb. (Rev. xix. 9.)

It appears to us certain, that all who will in any sense or degree, see or share millennial glory, must *then*, if alive, be changed; if sleeping in the dust of the earth, arise. Whether believers who have persistently opposed—and some have even ridiculed—pre-

Digitized by Google

millennial truth; whether those who have lived selfish lives, and so living have so died; and whether those who have failed to stand the test to which they have been exposed under the reign of Antichrist, will be raised or changed at this period, is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. According to Daniel xi. 35, "Some of them of understanding shall fall to try them, and to purge, and to make them white;" and according to Rev. xviii. 4, doubtless some *will* and some will *not* have obeyed the call, "Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." The purged and separated ones will doubtless participate in the second rapture, so as to be safely housed with the Lord in the air before the final crash and overthrow of Babylon, as recorded in this Rev. xviii.

Now, if our reading of Rev. xvii. be correct, we see the woman arrayed in purple and scarlet, whose forehead is inscribed "Mystery, Babylon the great," to be identical with the beast of Rev. xiii. 11, coming up out of the earth, which had two horns like a lamb, and spake as a dragon. As also we see the beast that rises up out of the sea in Rev. xiii. 1, identical with the scarlet coloured beast in Rev. xvii. 3, carrying the woman. As then in Rev. xiii. 5, we find power is given to the beast to continue forty and two months—the mystic period before named—it is found that during that time he grows weary of his rider, turns round upon her, hates her, makes her desolate, eats her flesh, and burns her with fire. The "horns" are said to do it, and therefore we read, Rev. xvii. 17, "For God hath put it in *their* hearts to fulfill his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled." Something of this kind has been seen in the past, and will be seen again in the near future, in the appropriation of Church revenues for secular purposes by act of Parliament in our own and other countries. When infidelity has grown rampant it will make short work with church property. *Illgotten* gain,—as much of it has been from the first—the lapse of centuries has not sufficed to make it *good*, and wrested from the people by the force or by the fraud of a crafty and covetous priesthood, the people will but recover *their own, as it shall seem to them.* And if the Commons willed it, what power would the Lords have—for long—to hinder it? Already the growing power of the Commons, and the waning power of the Lords spiritual and temporal, in this and other countries, points in that direction.

Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Austria, and Spain are ripening for action in opposing the priestly domination in the respective governments. And surely its arrogance and folly in opposing popular measures, is serving to help along its downfall. For still she—this woman Babylon—"saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore, shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire, for strong is the Lord God who

Digitized by Google

judgeth her. For in her is found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth." (Rev. xviii. 7, 8, and 24.) Who *Rome* accounts Babylon, we are not aware, but since the Reformation, Protestants have been unanimous in accounting Rome to be Babylon; in later days Nonconformists have included all State Churches under the term Babylon; in later days still, Plymouth Brethren *and some others* have included all sects *but their own* in the term Babylon. *We* have learned to account *all* as Babylon who have confused and confounded Christ with Belial, bearing the name of Christ, while either destitute of, or uncontrolled by, the Spirit of Christ.

The men who quote Scripture while yet a lie is in their right hand, are *in* Babylon, whatever their ecclesiastical surroundings may be, and unless delivered from it, must perish in its overthrow, however flattering themselves, or flattered by their fellow men.

A *counterfeit* of the Bride, the Lamb's wife, is this mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, and drunken with the blood of saints as John saw her, well might he say, "I wondered with great wonder" (see Alford). And in the beast that carries her a while, and afterward destroys her, we see the kings of the earth with whom she has committed spiritual fornication, so long as they could promote each other's interest, and serve each other's ends; but eventually *they* become mutual enemies. So long as Victor Emmanuel conceded temporal sovereignty to Pius IX., the Pope blessed the king; but the states of the church annexed, the blessings became succeeded by curses. This little cloud, no bigger than a man's hand, is without doubt, precursor of the approaching storm.

And thus God will judge and destroy the harlot by the beast that carried her; and the beast with the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, God himself judges and destroys finally, Rev. xix. 20; but this their end is not yet; "judgment must *begin* at the house of God."

For first we have to consider two notable events which now rise to our view, and we confess to some difficulty felt as to which shall have the precedence. For cogent reasons we sometimes feel compelled to place in point of time, the marriage of the Lamb *before* the judgment seat of Christ; but again, for other and still more urgent reasons, we decide *the reverse;* and seeing allusion to that judgment occurs in Rev. xi. 18, whereas the marriage supper has no mention until Rev. xix. 7, we decide to consider next, the judgment seat of Christ distinctly set forth by the apostle, Rom. xiv. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 5; and 2 Cor. v. 10.

Hackney. N. STARKEY.

*(To be continued.)*

Digitized by Google

# DR. PARKER ON IMMORTALITY.

WE feel ourselves under considerable obligation to Dr. Parker for his two able and eloquent lectures on the subject of *Human Immortality*, delivered in the City Temple on the 9th and 16th of May, 1878, and almost simultaneously published in the *Fountain*. For although we must confess ourselves unable to appreciate the force of certain of his arguments, and equally unable to acquiesce in some of his conclusions, we have yet found his treatment of the whole subject so fresh and suggestive, that it has led us to reconsider, to modify, and in one very important respect at least to relinquish the opinions we had previously entertained.

In the following brief and fragmentary remarks we shall not attempt to deal with Dr. Parker's theory as a whole, but simply direct the attention of the readers of the RAINBOW to *two points*, which seem to us to be the keys of that theory and with neither of which do we find ourselves able to agree.

The first of these opinions has reference to what Dr. Parker has called "the original charter of propagation and dominion," the terms of which are to be found in the first chapter of Genesis: "And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that creepeth upon the earth." (Gen. i. 26-28.) The terms of this charter must be read in connection with those of the second charter, "whose terms are richer, fuller, and grander altogether than those of the first," as it is recorded in the second chapter of Genesis: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." (ii. 16, 17.)

On the combined terms of these two charters—assuming that they really are two—Dr. Parker thus comments:—"To fix almost exclusive attention upon the word 'die' in the terms, 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,' is to fall below the level of the divine purpose. It is to attempt to navigate a ship by its own lights rather than by the heavenly bodies. The meaning of the charter is in the words, 'God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him.' Fix yourself amidst the ever-changing and most incongruous accidents of human will and human action, and you will find it impossible to predicate or affirm anything with certainty; it would be like building upon the sand: but fix yourself in the purpose and plan of God, and you will build upon

Digitized by Google

a broad and lasting rock. This is what I endeavour to do in reading the terms in which the creation of man is announced: I know that the word 'die' occurs in the second charter, but which is to be the key-word of the sentence—the word which relates to a possible action on the part of *man*, or the word which announces the distinct and gracious purpose of God? Accepting God's purpose rather than man's possible conduct as my guide, I do not hesitate to address man as immortal. If it could understand me, I should not hesitate to address an acorn as an oak, even although it had deliberately elected to be thrown into the fire and to perish in ashes; and if I wanted that acorn to accept my gospel of expansion and majesty I would not address it in the littleness of its present condition, but in the grandeur of the divine secret which it embodies." (Lecture I.)

Now all this appears to us as true as it is eloquent—it merely embodies in a more forcible manner than we could have done, our own long-cherished convictions. Nevertheless that it supplies any solid or scriptural basis for the idea of "immortality *nisi*"—an idea for which Dr. Parker displays a natural parental partiality—as distinguished alike from "conditional immortality" on the one hand and "absolute immortality" on the other, we more than doubt. To speak plainly, this "immortality *nisi*" seems to us nothing better than a veiled contradiction in terms. *Nisi*, as Dr. Parker condescends to inform us, means "unless." Immortality *nisi*, therefore, means immortality *unless*. But unless *what?* Two suppositions alone are possible; it must mean either,—unless it is not yet immortality; or,—unless it ceases to be immortality. If the former alternative be accepted, then we simply come back to the conception of "conditional immortality" in the very form in which it is understood and maintained by such writers as Mr. White and Mr. Constable. If the latter alternative be accepted, a logical contradiction is involved. Immortality is an infinite quantity and can never therefore become finite. The immortal can never become mortal, the terms contradict and nullify each other. We might as well speak of light ceasing to be light, or of truth ceasing to be truth.

Does it follow, then, that "conditional immortality" as commonly understood and taught is alone true? that man, in himself created mortal becomes immortal only by a spiritual union with the risen Saviour,—a participation of that eternal life which the Father hath given to the Son to have in himself? No; for if this be the *whole* truth what is the meaning of those great words, "God *created* man in his own image?" We hold with Dr. Parker that these words contain the very essence of God's gracious and unchangeable purpose; while the word "die" is but its accident. Nay, we hold much more than Dr. Parker, for we hold that God's purpose *cannot* be frustrated by any power in heaven or earth, for has he not said: "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure?" (Isaiah



Digitized by Google

xlvi. 10). To say, moreover, "Facts give a very distinct and mournful answer to the inquiry, If God *designed* the soul to be immortal, is it in the power of the soul to *frustrate* the divine purpose? God designed the soul to be *good*, but the soul can frustrate the divine purpose; God designed the soul to be *wise*, but the soul can frustrate the divine purpose; God designed the soul to be *blessed*, but the soul can frustrate the divine purpose" (Lecture I.); this is to compare things that differ essentially. Goodness, wisdom, blessedness are not necessarily infinite; but immortality, in the true sense, is so. A man may be more or less good, more or less wise, more or less blessed, but he cannot be more or less *immortal*. He must be either absolutely immortal or wholly mortal, and between these two there is no room for such a conception as "immortality *nisi*."

We hold, then, on the one hand, that in the purpose and decree of the Eternal, which stands in life or in death, man was created immortal, and therefore can never cease to be. The divine image is the charter of his immortality. And yet at the same time we know, on the other hand, that inasmuch as it was declared to Adam, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," it was possible for him to become, and that in point of fact he did become, the subject of death. How then? Have we here a Scripture antinomy? We think not; a door of escape remains; a means of reconciliation is still to be found.

Besides the word "image" and the word "die," there is in the original charter a *third word*, which Dr. Parker has not defined,—that word is "*Man:*" "God created MAN in his own image." Now, how are we to understand this word "man?" What man is intended? Is it man as the first created individual, or man as the aggregation of all the individuals of our race? or is it MAN GENERIC —the *genus*, the race, the nature? This is a most important question, and happily the original leaves us in no doubt as to its correct answer. The Hebrew word is אדם (Adam), and is the *generic* name of the family of man. "Man," says Lange, "indicates collective humanity according to its origin in the first human pair, or in the one man in general, who was certainly the universal primitive man and the individual Adam in one person. Adam, referring to *Adamah;* the red one, from the red earth, out of which he was taken."* "The *generic term*, Adam," says Mr. Stanley Leathes, "becomes in the case of the first man (also) a denominative. . . . The name of Adam was not confined to the father of the human race, but like *homo* was applicable to woman as well as man, so that we find it said in Gen. v. 1, 2, 'This is the book of the history of Adam in the day that God created Adam, in the likeness of God made he him, male and female created he them, and called

* Commentary on Genesis, *in loc.*

Digitized by Google

*their* name Adam in the day when they were created."* And hence Kalisch observes, "It is probable that, in the earliest generations, the children did not at their birth receive any specific proper name, they were designated as the first, second, son or daughter; they all belonged to the *generic family of Adam;* the first man never received another name; his wife was, at first, comprised in the same appellation. (Gen. v. 2.)"†

Here, then, we seem at last to find the key which unlocks the whole mystery. It was *man generic*, Adam, that was in God's eternal purpose "created in his own image;" not *men individually;* that purpose taking its inception in one ideal form set up not first when Christ was born at Bethlehem, but from everlasting, in Him who is "the Lamb slain from before the foundation of the world;" though it reaches its ultimate realisation only in the glorification of the many brethren who are to be "conformed to the image" of that firstborn Son. The true and vital distinction, it will follow, is not between "immortality *nisi*" and "immortality *absolute*," but between immortality *generic* and immortality *individual*. The race is, in the unchangeable purpose of the Most High, immortal, because the race was in Christ before it was in Adam; but every individual member of that race is not necessarily so. May we not venture to say of man, "All are not Adam who are of Adam?" even as Paul says of Israel, "All are not Israel who are of Israel." We could not, with Dr. Parker, address any given number of human beings as "immortal souls;" yet we could freely say to them, Your nature is designed for immortality; you belong to an immortal race; your glorious inheritance is eternal life in Christ; and if you fail to attain that inheritance; if you count yourself unworthy of everlasting life; if with more than Esau's profanity you sell your birthright; then you will sink below the level of humanity; you will "not merely *decline a privilege*, but reverse and annul a *destiny;* you will not only refuse an offer, but quench within you a spirit that *makes* you a man."

This interpretation of the word "*man*" as it occurs in the original charter, and the distinction which it enables us to draw between *generic* and *individual* immortality, enables us also, as well as Dr. Parker's distinction between immortality *nisi* and immortality absolute, to "turn to the best account *every element and particle of truth in the traditional belief upon this subject.*" On this point Dr. Parker says, and we can cordially endorse the words we are about to quote:—"These traditional beliefs may be thus expressed:—Man is inherently immortal; he is so constituted that he cannot die. He must therefore live for ever, either in heaven or in hell, in bliss or in woe.—I hold that this conception is founded upon a very deep truth. I do not wonder that the doctrine

* Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.
† Commentary on Genesis, *in loc.*



Digitized by Google

is held by reverent and powerful minds, not from any satisfaction in thinking upon the suffering of the wicked, but from a sincere conviction relating to the dignity of man in the purpose and counsel of God. An able writer upon the whole subject says: 'If "immortal" signifies *designed to live for ever*, then Adam was created immortal: if it means *certain to live for ever*, then he was created mortal.' . . . In what Christ came to do for man I most clearly see the scope and purpose of the original creation of manhood. Christ assumes the fact of the foreordained destiny of man, and immediately addresses to him the most spiritual of all changes, 'He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned!' The appeal is to a rational and responsible being, to a being in whose very constitution there is something which exactly co-ordinated with the gift which was offered. *This* is the deep truth on which the common belief is founded. The very coming of Christ recognised the original dignity of man, for is not man represented as the hundredth sheep that had left the fold, the tenth piece of silver that was lost, the child that had strayed away?—not as a goat that might be turned into a sheep, not as iron that might be turned into silver, nor as a stranger that might be turned into a son; but throughout the parabolical signs the original dignity is assumed. But is not a distinct and vital *conversion* insisted on in the Bible? Undoubtedly. Absolutely. Incessantly. The most emphatic and pathetic 'Yes' must be the answer, but that conversion is a *return* to an original purpose, a making sure of the calling and election of God. Christ came not to destroy the law of man's constitution, but to fulfil it." (Lecture I.)

Moreover, this distinction enables us, quite as well as Dr. Parker's distinction, to make our appeal to the nobler instincts and the higher aspirations of men. We are quite at one with the eloquent lecturer when he says: "I cannot but feel that some eminent teachers have considerably impaired their influence by at least appearing to spend most of their strength in proving the *perishableness* of man. To my joy I know that they believe, as strongly as I do, that in the purpose and counsel of God man was created *immortal;* but it is my distinct impression that they have made far too little of this all-important fact, and have made proportionately too much of the perishableness of man. I take my stand on the word, 'God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him.' *That* is my appeal to every man; it is *there* that I lay hold upon every soul coming to hear the gospel. I do not say, 'You may *become* immortal;' I say, 'You may kill your soul, you may be destroyed body and soul in hell; the soul that sinneth it shall die,'—and thus by magnifying the purpose of God in their creation, I do not allow them to escape by declining a privilege; I urge upon them the appalling consideration that they are reversing and destroying a *destiny*. To my thinking there is all the difference in the world between these two ways of putting the

Digitized by Google

case. I do not look upon man as an instrument that can be in any sense *adapted* to immortality, but as a being that was *meant to be* immortal, and as a being whose reason for existence at all *is to be found in his immortality*. Say that God meant him to be immortal, and at once there is a sufficient and glorious reason for calling him into existence. This will not prevent you from declaring his mortality and perishableness. God himself declared it from the beginning when he said, 'In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,' proving that the immortality was not what is called necessary or inherent, for then the word 'die' could have had no possible place in the terms upon which human existence was held. If I were addressing an acorn I should not hesitate to speak of it as an oak; and if I wanted that acorn to accept my gospel of expansion and majesty, I should not dwell upon the smallness and insignificance of its present form, but upon the grandeur of the secret which it embodies." (Lecture I.)

But this is not all. For while the distinction we have drawn between *generic* and *individual* immortality thus enables us to secure all the advantages which flow from Dr. Parker's distinction between immortality *nisi* and immortality absolute, it at the same time relieves us of certain serious, and we may say fatal, objections under which the latter distinction appears to labour. For example:

1. It relieves us of the theological blunder—a blunder which, as it seems to us, lowers and degrades the whole character of the gospel—of regarding the redemptive work of Christ as *a mere restoration* rather than *a sublime elevation* of our human nature. Dr. Parker says, "Conversion is a *return* to an original purpose, a making sure of the calling and election of God. Christ came not to destroy the law of man's constitution, but to fulfil it." And again, "How did *Jesus Christ* speak about the soul? His words are, 'What is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' This is immortality conditioned, or immortality *nisi*; here is a soul—not a soul to be *gained* by goodness, but a soul to be *lost* by folly; a soul not to be secured by a course of obedience, but to be exchanged and forfeited. The assumption is distinctly in favour of the soul's immortality in the counsel and purpose of God. . . . James says, 'He that converteth a sinner from the error of his ways shall save a soul from death.' Here is conditional immortality—the condition being, not that immortality may be *gained*, but that immortality may be *lost*. The construction of the sentence assumes this, and cannot, as it now seems to me, be made to assume anything else." (Lecture II.)

But this is surely to form a very superficial and inadequate conception of that "mystery of God" which is confessedly great. The Son of God became incarnate not simply to restore man to the position and the inheritance which he at first possessed in Adam, and subsequently lost; but to raise him in Christ to a far higher platform. Man was made, in Adam, "a little lower than the

Digitized by Google

angels," but in Christ he is "crowned with a glory and honour" far above any they possess. Christ came not only that men "might have life, but that they might have it abundantly." "The first man, Adam, was but a living soul; the last Adam alone is a life-giving spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is soulish; and afterwards that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth earthy; the second man is from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And even as we bore the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." (Psa. viii. 5; John x. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 45-49.) "The true creation of man," says Lange, "as man was an inspiration. The *primus homo* was the first man thus inspired; who became the progenitor of the species. The first Adam was made by the divine life raising the physical or animal into the rational. The second Adam represents a higher inspiration, elevating the rational and human into a closer union with the divine. Such is the analogy of the Apostle Paul. (1 Cor. xv.) Christ elevates the first human, even as the first human 'by the inspiration of the Almighty' is the uplifting of the merely animal or physical that lay below."

2. Again, our distinction between *generic* immortality and *individual* immortality, relieves us from the necessity of assuming, as Dr. Parker is forced to assume, that God's eternal purpose not only may be, but is frustrated by man. An assumption which to our mind as seriously damages the foundation of the Gospel as that which we have just considered dwarfs its superstructure. All our hopes of eternal life and blessedness rest ultimately on the unchangeableness of God's character, love, and therefore purpose. If that purpose can fail or be frustrated, we have no security that anything shall endure. The pillared firmament then becomes as rottenness, and the rock of ages as but shifting sand. Dr. Parker asserts that facts give a very distinct and mournful answer to the question: "Is it in the power of the soul to frustrate the divine purpose?" But he has not proved that it is so. As we have already pointed out, it is no answer to say that God designed the soul to be good, and wise, and blessed. The cases are not parallel. God does indeed *desire* that every soul of man should be all these, but He has not *decreed* it. That the predestinating purpose of God cannot fail of its accomplishment Paul distinctly teaches us in his Epistle to the Romans, when he says, "Whom he did predestinate, them he also called, and whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified." (Rom. viii. 30.) In the generic immortality of man, the divine purpose stands unimpaired, nor shall aught be found lacking at last in that mystical body which is "the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Of Christ mystical as truly as of Christ personal it may be said, "Not a bone of him shall be broken."

Digitized by Google

3. Lastly, this all-important distinction between *generic* immortality and *individual* immortality, affords a broad and solid foundation on which to build those larger hopes of the destiny of man which some of us are fain to entertain. The immortality of *the race* stands in the eternal purpose of God, and is realised in spiritual union with the risen Saviour. "*Adam*" shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation. But this Adam, this race, "the many" of Rom. v.; the "all" of 1 Cor. xv., cannot possibly mean any small proportion or even *a minority* of mankind. It is, we know, characteristic of the human race to possess ten fingers and ten toes; but some men have, nevertheless, possessed a larger or smaller number. The comparative rarity of such cases, however, proves them to be only exceptions establishing the rule. If, however, the majority of mankind, or even any considerable proportion, possessed *twelve* fingers and *twelve* toes, then we could not say that *ten* fingers and *ten* toes were characteristic of humanity; the exception would then become the rule, and the rule the exception—even so, then, we argue in regard to the destiny of mankind; life will be the rule, death the exception; life the almost universal rule, death the comparatively rare exception. The spiritual Gittites (2 Sam. xxi. 19) of our race, we may at least entertain the hope, will be found almost as exceptional as the physical, when "the end" shall come, and Christ, in the exercise of his mediatorial sovereignty having "put down all rule and authority, and power," shall deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor. xv. 24-28.)

The consideration of the second point in Dr. Parker's argument, to which we designed to call attention, must be reserved for another paper. W. MAUDE.

---

## RE-TRANSLATIONS.

### PSALM VIII.

O H Jehovah, our Sovereign! how illustrious [is] thy name in all the earth—
Thou whose splendour has gone forth over the heavens!
Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou founded strength,
Because of thine enemies, to make foe and revenger be Still.
When I behold thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,
Moon and stars which thou hast established,—
What [is] weak man, that thou shouldst be mindful of him,
Or a son of Adam,* that thou shouldst visit him;
And then shouldst make him little less than God,
Both with glory and with honour shouldst crown him;

* Son of the soil, child of the dust.

Digitized by Google

Shouldst give him dominion over the works of thy hands,
All things shouldst have put under his feet—
Sheep and oxen, all of them,
Yea even the beasts of the field,
Birds of the heavens, and fishes of the sea,
Everything passing along the paths of the sea.
O Jehovah, our Sovereign! how illustrious [is] thy name in all the earth!

### ISAIAH II. 2-4.

AND so it has come to pass, in the afterpart of the days,
That established becomes the mountain of the house of Jehovah at the head of the mountains,
And exalted above hills;
Then have streamed unto it all the nations,
Then have journeyed many peoples, and have said:—
Come ye! and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah,
Unto the house of the God of Jacob;
And let him instruct us out of his ways,
And we will walk in his paths.
For out of Zion goes forth instruction,
And the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem.
So has he judged between the nations,
And given sentence to many peoples:
So have they beaten their swords into ploughknives,
And their spears into pruninghooks:
Nor lifteth nation against nation the sword,
Nor learn they any more to make war.

---

## CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.*

(*Continued from page* 231.)

THE second objection which Canon Farrar makes to our theory of Conditional Immortality is that "it rejects that instinctive belief in immortality which has been found in almost every age and every race of man" (xvi.). One would certainly suppose from these words that our author meant to say that a belief in the immortality of the race was all but universal among mankind in every period of time and in every land. He allows that there may have been a few minds in some ages and lands who had not this instinctive faith. With these exceptions, few and far between, his words seem to affirm that all mankind, from the beginning of the world to the present day, have believed in their immortality. However they might regard it, with fear or hope or unconcern, they were satisfied they were possessed of a life which could never end, entering into the spirit of Bossuet's epigrammatic saying:—

"Voulez le, ne la voulez pas, votre éternité vous est assuré."

---

* "Eternal Hope." By Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D., Canon of Westminster. Second Edition. 1878.

Digitized by Google

With all respect to Canon Farrar we say that such a view as he here gives us of human opinion is very, very different from that which is borne out by facts. As this subject is one of the very deepest importance, our readers will pardon us if we dwell a little upon it.

Buddhism is the popular confutation of anything like a universal belief of man in his immortality. It is a religious system of the East which is supposed to have arisen six hundred years before Christ, and which is said to be now held by about four hundred millions of men. It teaches that annihilation of individual life is the supreme bliss to be desired, and points out to its adherents how it is to be obtained. So far are mankind from believing now or in past times in their immortality! If we wish to ascertain what was the common opinion of men on this subject in the centuries before and after the preaching of Christianity, let us turn to the writings of the early fathers. We have all, of course, heard of the heathen tales of the Shades, of Elysium and of Tartarus, but in reality little serious belief was attached to these silly stories. Lactantius, a father of the fourth century, who ranks high as an authority, expressly affirms of the heathen generally of his own and previous times, that "they think that man is destroyed by death. And from this persuasion," he adds, "all the errors both of the common people and also of the philosophers arise." * Instead of supposing, with Canon Farrar, that mankind had an instinctive faith in their immortality, he attributes any belief in an "existence after death" which was entertained to "the arguments of great philosophers, and the answers of seers, and the divine words of prophets." From Lactantius in the fourth, let us turn to the testimony of Tertullian in the second and third centuries. "The resurrection of the dead," he says, "is the Christian's trust. To the belief of this truth compels us—that truth which God reveals, but *the crowd* derides, *which supposes that nothing will survive after death.*" He adds, "the wise, too, join with the vulgar crowd in their opinion sometimes. There is nothing after death, according to the school of Epicurus. After death all things come to an end, even death itself, says Seneca to like effect."† So little reality is there in Canon Farrar's suggestion that mankind, with scarcely an exception, have and have had an instinctive belief in their immortality.

Having seen that there is, and has been, anything but a universal belief on the part of the mass of mankind in their immortality, let us now turn more especially to the opinions of the more intellectual and cultivated among men, aptly and best represented to us by the various schools of philosophy, especially the philosophy with which we are best acquainted, that of Greece. We might perhaps imagine that ignorance or brutal manners might have had some effect in quenching or diminishing that "instinctive belief," of which Canon Farrar speaks, on the part of the rude masses of mankind; but that, if there was indeed in the human bosom such a belief, we should find it very generally asserted and taught by the cultivated mind of man. Here, however, the belief in immortality was just as far, if not farther, from general acceptance as among uncultivated humanity. Of the four great schools of Grecian philosophy, the Epicurean, the Stoic, the Aristotelian, and the Platonic, while all

* Works of Lactantius. T. T. Clark. Book v. chap. xix.
† Tertullian on Resurrection. Chap. i.

Digitized by Google

discussed repeatedly the great theme, the three former absolutely rejected it, the last only held to it, and that in a vague, uncertain, unsatisfactory, and often contradictory way. The Epicurean philosophy, the most generally accepted of all, taught that death ended all existence for all men. The Stoical philosophy extended the existence of the soul for a time beyond death, but held that finally it would be annihilated, in this closely resembling a widely prevalent idea of the East, now and in all past times, of which we have certain accounts.* Archbishop Whately describes Aristotle as one who "speaks of death as the complete and final extinction of existence, beyond which there is neither good nor evil to be expected."† Plato and his school alone had any belief in man's immortality. They hoped earnestly that there was such a thing. They reasoned for it with all the power of intellects of the very highest order among men. Socrates, Plato, Cicero, and others less widely known to fame, exerted all the powers of their minds to prove to others, ay, and to prove to themselves, that there was for the human soul beyond the grave another and an endless existence, that all man's hopes did not perish when, to outward sense, he seemed to die, but that somewhere or other, within the earth, or beyond the seas, or above the stars, there was a habitation where the minds, which here had enjoyed and suffered, had speculated and had reasoned, should continue throughout an endless life the thoughts that were here only begun. Such is the actual state of philosophical opinion among the Grecians on immortality, far indeed removed from anything like a universal instinctive faith in it!

In the Phædo of Plato, where the great scholar gives an account of the reasonings of his great master in favour of the immortality of the soul, we find the frequent confession that it was a dogma not generally accepted, but one which Socrates sought to introduce to the acceptance of his time. The argument is carried on in the way of dialogue between Socrates and some of his friends. In paragraph xiv. one of them, Cebes, thus states the opinion then commonly received: "Other things, Socrates," he says, "appear to me to be correctly stated; but those things affirmed about the soul are widely disbelieved among men, who fear lest when it is separated from the body it may no longer exist, but that on that very day on which a man dies it should perish and be destroyed, swiftly separated from the body and going forth, dispersed like the wind or smoke, it should be dissipated and utterly come to an end."‡ Such was philosophic opinion, well described thus by the learned historian, Gibbon: "The writings of Cicero," he says, "represent in the most lively colours the ignorance, the errors, and the uncertainty of the ancient philosophers with regard to the immortality of the soul. When they are desirous of arming their disciples against the fear of death, they inculcate, as an obvious though melancholy position, that the fatal stroke of our dissolution releases us from the calamities of life; and that those *can no longer suffer who no longer exist*. Yet there were," he adds, "a few sages of Greece and Rome who had conceived a more exalted, and in some respects a juster idea of human nature;

* "Life in the Forests of the Far East." By Spenser St. John, vol. i. pp. 181-2.

† "Scripture Revelations of a Future State." 7th edition, p. 26.

‡ Plato. Phædo, paragraph xiv.

Digitized by Google

though it must be confessed that, in the sublime inquiry, their reason had often been guided by their imagination, and that their imagination had been prompted by their vanity."*

Gibbon's account of the unsatisfactory nature of the arguments of the few philosophers who reasoned for man's immortality, is quite just. Scarcely any of them were consistent. Few of them succeeded in perfectly persuading themselves. All of them rested their faith, such as it was, on grounds which are perfectly inadmissible by men who accept the Bible as God's word. Archbishop Whately gives the following description of the inconsistency of their greatest reasoner, Plato. "Among the heathen philosophers," he says, "Plato has been appealed to, as having believed in a future state of rewards and punishments, on the ground that the passages in his works in which he inculcates the doctrine are *much more numerous than those in* which he expresses his doubts of it."† Cicero, the greatest advocate for man's immortality among the Romans, speaks thus sadly: "I have perused Plato," he says, "with the greatest diligence and exactness, over and over again; but I know not how it is, whilst I read him I am convinced; when I lay the book aside and begin to consider by myself of the soul's immortality, *all the conviction instantly ceases.*" Here was a grand mind—one of the greatest in heathen antiquity! He longed to believe in immortality. He drew out in his Tusculan Questions all the reason he could advance for it. He felt all these to be only a foundation of sand. He showed it in the despairing letter in which he bewails his daughter's death. He sorrowed as one without hope.

But besides this the ancient philosophers based their hesitating faith on a ground which wholly separates them from Christian reasoners on this subject. These latter believe that the soul of man had a beginning. Without exception every ancient philosopher who believed in its continued existence held that it had no beginning. If Plato believed it had a beginning he would also have believed that *it must end.* "It is a thing very well known," says the learned Cudworth, "that, according to the sense of philosophers, these two things were always included together in that one opinion of the soul's immortality, namely, its *pre-existence as well as its post-existence.* Neither was there any of the ancients, before Christianity, that held the soul's future permanency after death, who did not likewise assert its pre-existence; they clearly perceiving, that if it were once granted that the soul was generated, it could never be proved but that it might also be corrupted."‡ Between the school of men who of old reasoned for man's immortality and the modern school of Christian Platonists there is no real unity. Plato would utterly refuse to own them as his disciples.

It is in fact Christianity, and, pre-eminently, the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, which has given the assurance of immortality to man. "Where," says Mr. Perowne, "shall man find the ambrosia of immortality? How shall he be quite sure of—not desire merely, nor tremblingly expect, nor doubtfully anticipate or dread—a life beyond this life? How shall he be sure that death has no power to destroy

* Gibbon's Decline and Fall, chap. xv.
† Scripture Revelations of a Future State. 7th edition, p. 25.
‡ Cudworth. "Intellectual System," b. i. chap. i. § 31.

Digitized by Google

him; but that he, the same person, the same in his memory, in his thoughts, in his affections, in his will, shall continue, knowing himself to be himself, and perpetuating his own individual existence beyond the grave? Christianity answers by two facts:

"I. First by the resurrection of Christ.

"II. And next by the life of Christ communicated to us."*

One of the hymns for Easter in "Hymns Ancient and Modern" carries out the true basis of immortality:—

"The First-begotten of the dead,
For us he rose, our glorious Head,
Immortal life to bring;
What though the saints like him shall die,
They share their Leader's victory,
And triumph with their King."

There is the foundation of all sound reliable hope for immortality. The heathen world had no such hope. They had nothing on which they could rely. Their sentiment when brought to the calm sober bar of rational judgment was expressed in the sad lines of the Greek poet Moschus in his exquisite elegy on Bion:

"The meanest herb we trample in the field,
Or in the garden nurture, when its leaf
In autumn dies, forebodes another spring,
And from brief slumber wakes to life again:
Man wakes no more! Man, peerless, valiant, wise,
Once chilled by death, sleeps hopeless in the dust,
A long, unbroken, never-ending sleep."

There is heathen belief upon that subject of all others the most deeply interesting to man. It is most unlike the view which Canon Farrar gives of an "instinctive belief in immortality which has been found in almost every age and every race of man." (xvi.)

But there is undoubtedly something, yes, and a very great deal in the speculations of man upon this subject of immortality, as they show the acceptance or the rejection of it, hopes, or fears, or doubts, or sad complainings. And, moreover, we freely and frankly confess that no theory of man and his future which does not account for all this state of opinion, vague and uncertain as it is, can possibly be true. What then has been the exact state of opinion and thought on man's part on this great question of his immortality?

We say, then, in the first place, that man, as a rule, takes into his mind and conceives *the idea of immortality* as a thing possibly connected with himself. It is not one or two men here and there, it is not merely men of tender or of lofty mind, who conceive the magnificent idea of immortality, but mankind as a whole takes this idea into its range of thought. Not merely in almost every clime and age, but absolutely in every clime and in every age, man has sent his thoughts on into the limitless future, into the boundless ocean that has no shore, and has embraced the thought of the possibility that he, who has here drawn the breath of life, and here has loved and hoped and feared and inquired into the nature of things and felt how small a way beneath their surface he could go, might extend his being beyond that death which seemed its

* Perowne, I. I. S. "Immortality," p. 96.

Digitized by Google

termination, and take up the continuity of thought. Now this, we say, is a great and most important fact. This idea, we are quite ready to admit, partakes of the instinctive. This idea, we are fully persuaded, separates man from the lower creatures. They have never conceived the idea of their immortality. It has never dawned across their minds. Man has conceived it, everywhere, and at all times. We take it that this grand idea, from the mere fact of its conception, connects man very closely with immortality. But we go farther than this. We say that on the part of many minds, in every age and in every race, there is a longing for that immortality of which man has formed the idea. And we add, moreover, that it is the higher and the nobler minds among the heathen which chiefly have longed for it. Such men as Socrates and Plato and Cicero have had the desire, rather than the grovelling and the sensual. But on the other hand, it is equally true that the number of those who did not long for this immortality was greater than of those who did. There were more who hoped for annihilation as man's end than of those who hoped for eternal life. And, once more, the number of those who did not believe in immortality embraced a very large proportion of mankind, outnumbering those who did not desire it as a blessing. Many and many a noble soul there was which, having tasted what good even this life had for them, and having conceived the idea of a life to which this life's troubles were unknown, and longing for such a life, were yet fain to confess they had no grounds for belief in it. Such is a brief but true account of the real opinion of mankind apart from direct revelation upon this subject. There was on the part of all a conception of the idea. There was on the part of the generality a disbelief in its truth. Very many shunned it as a most undesirable thing. Some, the best and noblest of men, longed for it. Even of these some were not able to accept it as a reliable truth.

Do we deny or make little of those portions of this view which favour the idea of immortality as possible or probable for us? No; we cling eagerly to them. They are a great and a needed help to our faith in the doctrine of a future eternal life. The bare fact of the idea as generally conceived is to us a proof that between man and immortality there is some very close connection. What is that connection? Our view, we confidently assert, alone of all views gives its place and room to every part of the above view of man in relation to immortality. It accounts for every fact. It is true to nature. We suppose man originally to have been created immortal. Hence his conception of the grand idea of immortality, of which otherwise we do not suppose he would ever have had any instinctive idea whatever. For this immortality some, the nobler minds, longed with all their hearts. Does not this enter into our view? All the minds that love the pure and the true, that feel the nobility of existence, that cannot bear the idea of losing it, that long for a better and an endless life, do not these find their place in that view of life in Christ which gives assurance to that which was in them nothing beyond a hope? We hold that immortality is for those who will know how to use it. But others there are, and they the majority of the race, who do not believe in this immortality, to whom the prospect of it is an awful prospect, not a bright look out. Sunk, degraded, unhappy, unable to enjoy life, unfit to use it, fretting against

Digitized by Google

the pure and the true, they long for the rest which is found in non-existence. Our system answers this instinct as it answers every other. It is throughout natural. We claim that it is throughout Scriptural as well.

There is yet another objection to our view advanced by Canon Farrar to which we must refer as it is one frequently made and urged as of great force. We have dwelt upon it already in our work on "Future Punishment," and would here add something additional.* Dr. Farrar says of our theory that it "leaves us with the ghastly conclusion that God will raise the wicked from the dead *only* that they may be tormented and at last destroyed." (Preface xvii.)

This objection, as we have said, is repeatedly brought against our theory. We will give it in a somewhat fuller form than our author has done in order that there may be no mistake as to its nature. Dr. Salmon, of Trinity College, Dublin, thus states it. "Whatever moral difficulties," he says, "there are in believing in the eternal punishment of the wicked, appear to me to apply with still greater force to the hypothesis of their temporary punishment. *It would seem like vindictiveness*, if God were to raise men from the dead, and unite their bodies and souls, *only* in order that, having tormented them a number of years, he might then consign them to annihilation. . . . If it be God's intention to annihilate any, pity would suggest that he will do so without inflicting preliminary torment."† From this and the quotation from Canon Farrar we can fully understand this objection to our view.

It is urged then that if annihilation be the ultimate purpose of God for some, that it would be vindictive cruelty on his part to raise them up from their graves to suffer consciously at all. This objection can only be urged on the plea that such additional punishment would be unjust, or that it be useless. In reply we say that it would be neither unjust nor useless, and that therefore this objection falls to the ground.

We do not think there is any occasion to dwell on the first objection that may be made, viz., that such additional punishment would be *unjust*. Divine providence often inflicts suffering of this kind in this age, and we cannot see why he might not in another. But this objection is seldom made. The great stress is laid upon the notion that raising up any one to suffer conscious pain for a longer or a shorter period, when the ultimate end of that person is destruction, is unattended with any good object and is therefore cruelty. So far from supposing it *useless*, we believe that several possible or probable uses for such a procedure may be pointed out, but we will now only advert to one such. It will, we think, show the use, perhaps we might say the necessity for that resurrection of the wicked and their conscious temporary pain, which Canon Farrar describes as being on our view, a "ghastly conclusion."

Suppose then it were taught that for the wicked the first death which all die were their endless annihilation; that, do what they might, live as they might, oppress and wrong as they might, there was nothing more of conscious suffering to be feared than could happen to them in this life, that when they slept they would sleep on for ever, that no trumpet sound would

* The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment, 5th edition, p. 227. Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row.

† "Two Sermons." By George Salmon, D.D., 2nd edition. Dublin, 1865.

Digitized by Google

awake, no voice of judge be heard, no tribunal of justice be set up before which they should stand; in that case we say that a very great check would be removed from very many minds, and that bad as the world is it would then be worse. There are, unhappily but undoubtedly, very many minds to whom the idea of annihilation if it be unattended with conscious suffering has little deterrent power. Appeals must be made in their case to that which they will dread. While to some minds the prospect of annihilation comes home with tremendous power, urging them not to neglect a salvation which delivers them from so terrible a fate, there are other minds which must be approached by lower motives and whom the terrors of judgment must stir up to flee from wrath to come, or whose career of wickedness may at least be checked and kept in some restraint by the prospect of such. The theory then which teaches that the wicked will be raised to suffering before they are handed over to their utter and final destruction is of use and cannot be charged as cruel or vindictive. It may only lead some men, such as Felix or Herod, to tremble, or to an outward and partial reformation of conduct: it may lead others to true godly sorrow. (Acts xxiv. 25; Mark vi. 20.) In either case it has served a good purpose, and one worthy of God.

In taking leave of Canon Farrar, we beg to thank him for the kind manner in which he has spoken of us, and such of our works as he has seen on this great question. But we would also respectfully urge him to give a yet deeper attention to this momentous inquiry than he has done as yet. We would in especial ask him to apply the great powers of his mind to the Scriptural account of the nature of man. There is the root of this entire question. Error began with the misapprehension of it. (Gen. iii. 4.) Error will end when human nature is better understood, and immortality and life eternal seen to be no inalienable possession of man, but a gift at first conditionally given, withdrawn when the conditions were violated, restored in Christ Jesus, and which restoration constitutes the very essence of his blessed Gospel.

HENRY CONSTABLE.

---

# CANON GARBETT ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

## IV.

(*Continued from page* 262.)

7. OUT of twenty-four pages of the "Christian Observer," which are occupied with Canon Garbett's treatise on the Immortality of the Soul, about nine (770-776 and 840-842) are taken up with what we cannot help thinking a rather questionable psychology not very clearly stated. It is, however, as far as we are concerned, *nihil ad rem*. We might, and for argument's sake we do, admit it all as sound and good and true. Our position is not touched by it.

To some things said in the course of it, but not, as seems to us, at all

Digitized by Google

essential to it, we have raised decided objections. We may remind our readers of our remarks just made on certain observations (pp. 771, 772) on Matt. x. 28; also of our allusions to the hypothesis—erroneously supposed to be our hypothesis—"If the salvation of the soul only meant that life would be continued after death by the special gift of Christ," &c. (p. 772); as well as of what we urged against Canon Garbett's "enormous presumption" argument (p. 841). But with these exceptions we can let all those nine pages pass for what they are worth.

How little they are worth against us will appear from Canon Garbett's own words (p. 840), when coming to a close of his psychological argument:—"We do not affirm that our argument suffices to prove strictly that the soul is immortal; but it does prove indisputably that the soul is a distinct substance from the body, that it has a life of its own which survives after the life of the body has ceased; and that therefore the separation we call death does not kill the soul, but that both in the righteous and the wicked, it survives afterwards and survives continuously." That is, as the next sentence explains, it survives continuously up to "the resurrection and the judgment." So that this long psychological discussion introduced into an argument to prove the unconditional immortality of the soul "from Scripture, and from Scripture alone," only avails to "prove indisputably" what is fully admitted by those who deny the unconditional immortality of the soul.

We are tempted to make another remark on the following passage, occurring in a sentence, which seems added, as containing the net result of this psychological discussion, if not part of the discussion itself.

"Our contention is that death . . . when it is applied to the soul . . . bears the analogous* sense of immobility, insensibility, and unconsciousness; and the laws of thought are such that we cannot say this without implying the continued existence of that which is without motion, sensibility, and consciousness. We cannot affirm these states of what is not, and has gone to nothing. This is the sense in such passages as, 'If we be dead with Christ' (Rom. vi. 8); 'You who were dead in trespasses and sins hath he quickened' (Eph. ii. 1); 'Thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead' (Rev. iii. 1)."

This is strange doctrine indeed. We cannot help asking ourselves, Does Canon Garbett really mean it? or has he written hastily and without his usual care and thought?

1. On the last two of the texts adduced we have spoken already in connection with what follows, where they occur. But surely Canon Garbett knows that the words he quoted from Rom. vi. 8 really, and according to the literal rendering of the original, mean, "If we died with Christ." Does he really mean to predicate immobility, insensibility, or unconsciousness of the soul of either Christ or the Christian owing to the latter having died, or if he likes, being dead with the former?

2. But even as regards unregenerate souls dead in sins according to his meaning of those words, are they without motion, sensibility, and consciousness? Is an unregenerate man merely a body with an unconscious soul in it? When an unregenerate man dies and his body attains

* Analogous, that is, to the sense it bears "when it is applied to the body of a man" or "to the body of a beast," i.e., the cessation of the functions of life, consequent "immobility, insensibility, unconsciousness" (p. 842).

Digitized by Google

"through the cessation of the functions of life" to "consequent immobility, insensibility, unconsciousness," does his soul, which has been dead all along, continue to be without motion, sensibility, and consciousness? If so, then we have what some on our side contend for; but what we understood Canon Garbett as well as ourselves contended against—unconsciousness and insensibility in the intermediate state. Indeed, it would seem that Canon Garbett goes all the way, and farther, with the Christadelphians, and predicates unconsciousness, immobility, and insensibility of the soul from the birth of the man through life, through death, and on for ever. He maintains indeed that the soul exists without motion, sensibility, and consciousness, and that it exists for ever. But he would be a very contentious man who would care to argue about whether an entity exists for ever or not if it is for ever "without motion, sensibility, and consciousness."

8. Perhaps, however, Canon Garbett holds that the soul that was previously dead, and so "without motion, sensibility, and consciousness," is quickened after the death of the man or of the body, for the endurance of the intermediate state of torment in Hades; or at any rate that it is quickened and so gifted for the first time with motion, sensibility, and consciousness at the second resurrection, and for the endurance of the eternal torments of Gehenna. But then he must either deny all future penal death of the soul, "that the soul that sinneth it shall die," or else he must altogether change his meaning of "death when it is applied to the soul;" for clearly there can be no endurance of torment for a soul that is dead in the sense of being "without motion, sensibility, and consciousness."

There is no slight confusion in Canon Garbett's language, perhaps also in his thoughts on this matter. We venture to suggest to him, and to those of our readers who think with him, that it would be avoided by the adoption of conditional immortality for the soul and the eventual reality of death for both soul and body in the second death of the unregenerate; all previous mention of death for them being partial as regards the body, proleptic as regards the soul and the resurrection body, and perhaps also figurative as regards the corruption and loathesomeness and deadliness of sin. We may, surely, whether the Scriptures do so or not, speak of sin as death in the same figurative sense in which we speak of it as disease, blindness, leprosy, &c.

"Life to the body," says Canon Garbett (p. 846), "is the presence of the soul within it: life to the soul is the presence of God with it." But can the godless and the unregenerate, whose souls are dead, and so "without motion, sensibility, and consciousness," be said in that case to have life even in the body? Can the presence of a dead soul "unconscious, immovable, insensible," within it be life to the body? Besides, he had said before of "the soul and body" "united in one man"—"Each is an entity; each complete, each organised, each living. It is not only that the whole lives, but that each part lives with a life of its own." Either this is a psychology only of the regenerate (though it seems to be said of all mankind), or else there is further confusion and self-contradiction. Instead of soul and body each living with a life of its own, he says elsewhere that "life to the body is the presence of the soul within it," and that in the unregenerate the soul, though it



Digitized by Google

exists, yet is dead, and is "without motion, sensibility, and consciousness."

8. But to return to Canon Garbett's arguments from Scripture in favour of the unconditional immortality of the soul.

"There are," he says (p. 675), "two passages in the New Testament which press with peculiar weight on the disciples of conditional immortality. The one is Matt. xxv. 46: 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.'" But when he says further on that "it is admitted by the author of *Life in Christ*, the most important publication of the new school, that 'the punishment of whatever nature is as eternal as the life,'" it is easy to estimate the weight with which this passage presses upon us. It certainly teaches that "these," the wicked, "shall *not* go away into life eternal," that they shall not live for ever, and so it cuts at the root of unconditional immortality. But "the second passage is Mark ix. 44, 46, 'The fire that never shall be quenched, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Ordinary readers might suppose that Canon Garbett was not aware of what "disciples of conditional immortality" with one voice reply to any argument raised against them on the ground of this text, viz.: that the words are adopted from Isaiah lxvi. 24, where they are used of the worm and the fire, devouring the carcases of the men that have transgressed against the Lord, and that there neither the worm, nor the fire, nor what they feed on, are supposed by any sane expositor to last for ever: and that our Lord must have quoted Isaiah's words in Isaiah's meaning. If fire that never shall be quenched—or rather more literally and more truly fire that is not quenched—implies the everlastingness of what is consumed by it, then the gates and palaces of Jerusalem (Jer. xvii. 27), and the Greek ships mentioned by Homer, and the mortal bodies of the martyrs mentioned by Eusebius, as burned with unquenchable fire, as well as the chaff to which John the Baptist compared the wicked, must be everlasting. Some have held indeed—but with reference to Matt. xxv. 41 rather than to Mark ix. 44—that, as Bishop Jeremy Taylor puts it, "Though the fire is everlasting, not all that enters it is everlasting." We greatly prefer the argument that St. Jude puts into our mouths when he tells us of Sodom and Gomorrah having suffered the vengeance of eternal fire; that, to use Dr. Adam Clarke's words,—and he was a strenuous upholder of eternal torment,—"τὸ πῦρ αἰώνιον signifies an eternally destructive fire. It has no end in the destruction of the cities: they were totally burnt up, and never were, and never can be rebuilt."

Canon Garbett reasons, however, that "from the very point and object of the appeal" in our Lord's words, "it does follow that" not only the worm and the fire will last for ever, but "what is consumed by them will last also for ever." It is strange that he was not startled at the glaring contradiction in the very terms he uses here when he speaks of a thing that is *consumed, lasting for ever*. We have read of a bush that burned with fire but was not consumed: but according to Canon Garbett it might just as well have been consumed since even so it might have outlasted the burning. It would be very hard, however, to put his meaning into words that would *not* involve a contradiction in terms. What the worm devours must last for ever, according to him, as well as

Digitized by Google

what the fire consumes. But letting this pass, we proceed to notice his argument for the everlastingness of the body that is cast into Gehenna and consumed by the worm and fire there. It is derived "from the point and object of the appeal: for the argument is that any sacrifice, however great and painful, is after all little in comparison with the infiniteness of the suffering incurred by not making it." Of course this statement of the argument, by the very mention of "the *infiniteness* of the suffering," begs the whole question, and ignores all that we urge as to the plain meaning of our Lord's words as quoted from Isaiah. We would put the argument of our Lord's words thus, and leave it to our readers to judge which is the truer and fairer statement of it. "It is better and wiser, even for the interests of the very body that some would spare from suffering for righteousness' sake, to make it suffer even very terrible pain. It is better to cut off the gangrened limb than on account of it to lose the whole body and have it cast into Gehenna to the undying worm and the ceaseless fire that will prey on it there. Better apply the knife to the offending member than have the undying worm and the unquenched fire applied to the whole body ruined and destroyed through sparing the offending hand or foot. Better enter into life with one foot, one hand, or one eye, than have your whole body—your whole self—cast into the pit of corruption and destruction in the second death."

But in the course of the paragraph Canon Garbett comes round exactly to our opinion. "The punishment of the individual will therefore continue as long as the individual continues. From this conclusion there is no escaping." As we have said before, we have no desire to escape from it. It is exactly our position. Though how Canon Garbett reached it in the course of his argument is not very clear to us. He goes on, however, quite pertinently to ask, "How long then will the individual continue according to the revelation of the Word of God? Here the doctrine of immortality is thrown into the front. If the soul will last for ever, the punishment"—he means the torment—"must necessarily last for ever likewise. It is impossible to get rid of the doctrine of eternal punishment"—again he means eternal torment—"unless by denying the immortality of the soul." Precisely so. This is our argument exactly. This shows the importance of proving—what we demand to have proved to us, and what meantime we deny—the immortality of unregenerate souls. "How long will the individual" who goes into Gehenna "continue, according to the revelation of the Word of God?" We do not pretend to say exactly how long, nor to estimate exactly the few stripes as compared with the many, or the many as compared with the few. But we answer unhesitatingly, "not for ever." Abiding for ever, living for ever, eternal life, immortality,—these are predicated not of the lost but of the saved. We may surely answer Canon Garbett's question in the words of Justin Martyr in the second century: They—the wicked—will continue "as long as God wills them to exist and to be punished"—God, "who is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna."

## V.—JEWISH BELIEF IN THE TIME OF OUR LORD.

On looking carefully through Canon Garbett's pages to see if there were any argument of his that we had possibly left unnoticed, we came across the following (on p. 674):—"They say that the belief in the



Digitized by Google

natural immortality of the soul is partly to be referred to a Jewish, and partly to a Pagan, origin. The plea is a very rash one, and singularly open to retort. The Pagan traces of such a doctrine are but few and slight, and totally inadequate to explain its universal currency in the Christian Church. If, however, its origin be Jewish, whence did the Jews get it but from their Scriptures? But they misunderstood and corrupted those Scriptures, is the reply, in this as well as in other acknowledged particulars. If so, then why was it that the Lord Jesus Christ never corrected their mistakes, as he did correct their mistakes in other particulars?" (Then follow the observations as to the Jewish use of the word "eternal," which we quoted and answered at p. 61.)

Now it might be sufficient reply to this if we answered Canon Garbett's two questions contained in it as follows:—

His first question:—"If, however, its origin be Jewish, where did the Jews get it but from their Scriptures?"—We answer by asking another question or two. Did the Jews get all their notions from the Scriptures? Had not the Jews the same sources of false notions open to them as the Pagans? Did they get no false notions from the Pagans or from their own foolish hearts? Did they always understand their own Scriptures aright? We answer also, From the same source as the doctrine of the transmigration of souls which prevailed among them to perhaps an equal extent with the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul.

His second question is: "If so,"—i.e., if they misunderstood and corrupted their own Scriptures in this as well as in other acknowledged particulars,—"then why was it that the Lord Jesus Christ never corrected their mistakes, as he did correct their mistakes in other particulars?" This question is purposeless unless it means "in *all* other particulars." And we ask in reply, (1.) Did the Lord Jesus correct the mistakes of the Jews in all other particulars? as, for instance, in the matter of the transmigration of souls which seems to have been thrust on his notice in the question asked in John ix. 2, and which a believer in that doctrine might urge was supported by his reply? Did he correct all the mistakes of the Essenes or of the Herodians?

But (2) the question takes for granted that we have the record of all that Jesus ever said in controversy to the Jews of his day. Probably he did correct many of their mistakes, though the correction, as not concerning us, has not been recorded for our learning. And, above all (3), we maintain that the positive teaching of our Lord and his apostles as to who shall, and who shall not, live for ever, as to who shall have immortality and who shall not, who shall perish and who shall not, as to God being able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna,—does plainly and fully correct, and flatly contradict any false notions that the Jews may have had as to all men living for ever, as to the natural immortality of the soul, as to its being imperishable and indestructible in its nature.

But (4) we have so far taken for granted that the immortality of the soul and eternity of torment was, as Canon Garbett assumes, "the admitted belief of the Jews in our Lord's day." We have done this only for argument's sake, and to show how weak the case is, even on that supposition, for natural immortality as a truth of Divine revela-

Digitized by Google

tion, or of true religion. We are very far, however, from admitting any such thing. There may have been some few who held that all souls were immortal and imperishable, and that the wicked would therefore live in torment to all eternity. These our Lord, who, as was so greatly needed, "brought life and immortality to light by the Gospel," plainly and sufficiently corrected and contradicted by His positive teaching. But we believe that Jewish opinion on the subject, unformed as it was, was far more in the other direction, in the direction we mean of conditional immortality for the righteous and of everlasting destruction for the wicked.

Canon Garbett and others have allowed themselves to be deceived by Josephus, who undoubtedly is all on their side on this subject. He is their only witness, but by no means a respectable one. Let us hear what others have to say about him before we hear what he has to say for himself. Archbishop Usher remarks, "It is not to be disguised that, having promised to derive his materials from the sacred records of the Hebrews, without diminution or addition, he has done this with little fidelity. With the same design with which the Jesuit, Jerome Xavier, lately gave an interpolated gospel history to the Persians, he likewise gave his account of transactions recorded in the Old Testament," &c. Bishop Warburton, alluding to the fact that Josephus suppresses all mention of the golden calf, says, "This solution clears up all his difficulties, and shows the great historian's great consistency, as well as artful address, throughout his whole work." Citing, in a note, his tract against Apion, he says: "This was carrying his complaisance to the Gentiles extremely far. But the necessity was pressing, and he misses no opportunity of conciliating their good will." Mosheim remarks that "Josephus, as is well known, attempted to show that there was less difference between the religion of the Jews and those of other nations, than people generally supposed; in which he very frequently exceeds all bounds." Elsewhere, in the same work (Notes to Cudworth), he remarks that Josephus attributes to the Pharisees the doctrine of transmigration. Abarbanel states that "Josephus wrote placed in the hands of his masters, under their eyes, and trembling under their law." M. Chasles, in his "Etudes sur les premiers temps du Christianisme," says of the apologetic part of Josephus' works, "It is a masterpiece of finesse: never was the truth falsified with a skill more resolute, more subtle, and more deceptive." "Josephus, a man of versatile talent and great sagacity, might have been a great historian if he had been an honest man." Jost, of whom Mr. Denniston speaks as "a writer surpassed perhaps by none for competence, whether as regards information or candour," says in his "History of Judaism and its Sects," "The representations of Josephus upon this subject are of little worth." Dr. Traill, the translator of Josephus' "Wars," says in his essay on the personal character and credibility of Josephus, "At the present moment, no well-informed writer, taking the *religious* side of the argument, would think of defending the Jewish historian, or of vouching for his affirmations, in the manner which was once deemed to be incumbent upon the champions of belief." Bayle "had long been indignant with Josephus, and with those who have spared him in this matter." H. Paret (in Herzog's Cyclop., Art. Josephus), while he thinks "his credibility as a historian is in general

Digitized by Google

raised above all doubt," says, "The few instances, where he evidently, or apparently, colours the truth, or gives not the whole truth, which he must have known, betray nearly always a national or personal apologetic interest."

Now what does this witness, so respectable and so reliable, say on the subject before us? He says (Antiq. book xviii. ch. i. sec. 13) of the Pharisees, "They also believe that souls have an immortal vigour in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but that the former shall have power to revive and live again." This reviving, or living again, clearly means a resurrection which is predicated only of the righteous, and denied, in effect, as regards the wicked. So that here his account of the tenets of the Pharisees is utterly at variance with that of St. Paul in Acts xxiv. 15, "that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust." In the next section Josephus tells us, "But the doctrine of the Sadducees is this: that souls die with the bodies." This is Whiston's translation, but the word which Josephus used, and which Whiston renders "die with" is *συναφανίζει*,—lit. "vanish" or "perish with,"—which, omitting the prefix *συν*, is exactly the word used by St. Paul when he said (Acts xiii. 41), "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and *perish*."

In his "Wars of the Jews" (book ii., chap. viii., sec. 14), he makes the Pharisees "say that all souls are incorruptible (*ἄφθαρτον*); but that the souls of good men are only removed into other bodies; but that the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment (*ἀϊδίῳ τιμωρίᾳ κολάζεσθαι*). But the Sadducees . . . take away the belief of the immortal duration"—*διαμονην*, lit. the *survival* simply—"of the soul, and the punishments and the rewards in Hades." It is from this passage, where it speaks of the souls of good men being only removed into other bodies, that Mosheim and others have inferred, very probably as it seems to us, that Josephus represents the Pharisees as having held and taught the transmigration of souls.

Now clearly Josephus does not give a true account of the doctrine of the Pharisees; and even if his account were true, it would not make their doctrine true, even though our Lord and his apostles were utterly silent as to any contradiction of it, which most certainly they are not. Canon Garbett himself does not hold with them as to the non-resurrection of the unjust, or as to the transmigration of the souls of the good into other bodies.

Another very obvious remark suggests itself. There is no mistaking Josephus' meaning. Nor would there be any mistaking the meaning of such language if found in the Old or New Testament Scriptures. And such language, if found there, would be authoritatively decisive with us. But is it said there that "souls have an immortal vigour in them," that "all souls are incorruptible"? Is not such language conspicuous by its absence, and that from books that do teach largely about immortality and incorruptibility as well as about death and corruption?

W. T. HOBSON.

*(To be concluded.)*

Digitized by Google

# MR. MAUDE ON THE "RESURRECTION."

## ARTICLE III.—BIBLICAL.

IT is to be hoped that the preliminary and theoretic investigations already made into the merits of Mr. Maude's papers on this profoundly interesting subject, have taught us what it is we should look for in proceeding to examine those passages of Scripture which he adduces in support of his theory.

I. The first text we have to consider is Rom. viii. 9-11, which we quote in the sufficiently literal form in which it appears in *The Revised English Bible*.

"9. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. But if any one hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. 10. But if Christ is in you, the body *is* dead because of sin, but the Spirit *is* life because of righteousness. 11. And if the spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he who raised up Christ from the dead will give life also to your mortal bodies because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you."

*First*, it is observable that the apostle concedes that the body remains "dead" although "Christ" is in us. The inward presence of our Redeemer has not interfered with that—the body continues "death-doomed." This would seem to imply that there is some sort of necessity that the body should undergo death; otherwise the presence of the risen Jesus in the body would surely have abrogated the law of death even for it. Hence, and assuming that the apostle is here stating fundamental principles, we infer that the change awaiting those who are alive when the Lord comes will in some important respects be equivalent to death. It would seem as though there were something in the body needing to be got rid of, and which it is the province of death to remove.

*Secondly*, the mind is arrested by the strength of the next clause: "the Spirit is life because of righteousness." It is not enough to say that the spirit is "living," though "living" is the precise opposite of "dead:" the substantive "life" is used, conveying most naturally the notion of "life-giving," even as Christ himself is emphatically "the Life," because he gives life to men. The spirit of the believer in a subordinate sense is then a means of life to the entire man. How this is to be realised the apostle does not yet say; whether the spirit of the believer will form for him an entirely new body, or recover the old one from death is not yet indicated. But this at least is plain; and so far surely Mr. Maude is right, regeneration leads on by internal working to corporeal victory over death.

*Thirdly*, in a most striking manner the eleventh verse affirms that this corporeal victory for the regenerate man will be accomplished, not by the formation of an entirely new body irrespective of the old death-doomed one, but in and through the very body just given up as "dead." There are two remarkable things in the manner in which this fact is set forth. (1.) The apostle goes out of his way to particularise the believer's present mortal body; for we might well have expected him, when so closely uniting believers with Christ, to have applied to both the same language, and to have said: "If the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the

Digitized by Google

dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead will also raise you from the dead." But no! he prefers to depart from the phrase he has twice used of Christ, in favour of the peculiar expression, "will give life to your mortal bodies:" in which expression, however, we can scarcely, with Mr. Maude, see anything "startling," at least, in the word "mortal," since it would have been a little surprising if the apostle had said "immortal"—"will give life to your immortal bodies;" and, on the other hand, we can well believe that the apostle, whose favourite formula was, "We who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord," would not care to assume the actual death of his brethren, as he might have seemed to do had he adopted the expression "will give life to your dead bodies." The striking thing is that he should have particularised the body at all. (2.) Then we are impressed with the whole setting in which this specification of the mortal body is placed. It is, so to speak, let into the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; for that is what begins and ends the sentence. More than that: the apostle's conception of the significance of this Divine indwelling comes rolling in on the wave of a mighty circumlocution. "If," says he, "the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he who raised up Christ from the dead will give life also to your mortal bodies because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Why all this amplification? Manifestly because of the strength of the apostle's perception of the sacredness of the body, though a mortal one, which has received so distinguished and holy a guest. Such a body, he seems to say, must be rescued from its doom. And if just now, in verse 10, he appeared to say that death was imperative, so that those who are changed must as good as die; then, equally, here he must be held to imply the converse—that those who die must as good as not die; for truly, the native force of this eleventh verse, unqualified by other statements, is that, by reason of the indwelling Spirit, the actual death of the body doomed to death is to be averted.

*Fourthly*, to bring these various intimations into one view, it comes to this:—The believer's body, though it might have been expected to live, must die; though it might have been expected to die, must live; and its life is mediately to come from the believer's own new-born spirit. This last-named consideration suggests that in all probability the work of rescuing the death-doomed body must be begun in this life, while the spirit is in the body; for how can a man's spirit do anything towards quickening his body after he is dead? And yet we cannot go so far as to affirm with Mr. Maude "that this quickening of the mortal body is taking place *here* and *now*" (p. 465); the future tense "will quicken" alone forbids that. Nevertheless, the spirit of the regenerate man is here and now doing something by way of preparation for the quickening which lies in the future.

*Fifthly*, such then being the problem offered by this passage, what hypothesis will solve it? The most probable conjecture we can make is this:—*That out of the substance of the believer's present mortal body is now being provided the materialism required for his future immortal body.* This hypothesis appears to meet all the exigences of the case. It represents the great process of corporeal reconstruction as already begun, and assigns to the believer's energised spirit a leading part therein; nevertheless, regarding the immortal body itself as for the present "veiled"

Digitized by Google

and "in abeyance," it defers the actual quickening to the future; and finally, conceiving that the materialism of the immortal body is already as good as in existence, it makes the completion of the body depend, not on the arrival of a world which may come more than a millennium too late, but on the utterance of a word which will be sure to be spoken at the right "moment." Science promises to help us, and we are ready to bid her welcome. Assuredly, if her present surmise should be made good, and she should win her right to tell us with confidence that it is in harmony with the very essence of matter to suppose that something of the substance of our mortal bodies is here and now being transmuted into energy, which energy may hereafter be retransmuted into the very substance of our immortal bodies, we can have no other feeling than one of gratitude and delight in having had so supplied a missing link in our conceptions.

*Sixthly*, it is impossible to overlook the startling negative bearing of this passage upon all who are destitute of the Divine Indwelling. All such are excluded from the work of corporeal reconstruction here described. It would be trifling with the momentous words before us to treat them as consistent with the assurance that, whether Christ be in you or no, whether you are the temple of the Holy Spirit or no, in any case and all the same shall your mortal bodies be caused to live. Not, indeed, that the non-regenerate dead are not to rise. We have already, in our second article, guarded against any such conclusion. They will all rise, and that in bodies practically identical with those in which they died—the same in character, in memory, in merit; meet objects of Divine retribution, or it may chance of Divine forbearance and of remedial dealing not enjoyed before; to be dealt with, we are very sure, in a manner wholly worthy of GOD! But still, as there had in life been no such sacredness in their tenements of dust, therefore no such regard to their mortal materialism will be shown. The members of Christ are to have a triumph peculiarly their own. In fact, of this very thing our Lord himself would seem to have given us a significant assurance in that word of his: "And this is the Father's will who hath sent me, that of all which he has given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day" (R. E. B., John vi. 39).

II. We next advance to 1 Cor. xv. 35-54, by rapidly surveying which in paragraphs, we hope to confine ourselves within moderate limits.

*A. The Divine Sowing*, verses 36-44. Here (1) we have express warrant for holding as lightly as we fairly can to the body that now is—"*thou* sowest not the body that shall come into being," "therefore, be not so simple as limit the Divine Sower to the mere reproduction of the present human frame." (2) This beautiful analogy is certainly favourable to some continuity of materialism, however slender it may be, and through how great soever transformations it may pass. (3) It confirms an inference already drawn from Rom. viii., that death or something equivalent thereto is necessary to the corporeal reproduction. (4) Nevertheless, it strikingly exhibits, not a continuity of materialism only, but a continuity of life. The seed must die, but not wholly. (5) The seed when sown must have life in it, and therefore we agree with Mr. Maude in considering the objections of Locke, Whately, and Whitby to be unanswerable as lodged against the vague popular notion that it is the

Digitized by Google

dead body that is sown—in the grave. (6) But here we come to a stand. We cannot concede to these eminent men, as Mr. Maude *seems* too easily to concede, that it is when we are born into this world that we are sown. This is going too far in the opposite direction. The popular instinct is right in going to the grave with the seed; for are not "burying" and "sowing" synonymous terms? Its error consists in going to the wrong grave—to that of Adam the First, instead of that of the Second Adam. It has gone groaning along its gloomy way, bearing dead seed to a barren grave. But the philosopher, the logician, and the commentator, have conspired to make a mistake to match—they have gone to the wrong birth; to the first instead of the second. In their eagerness to secure living seed they have said: "He that has a human father and mother has the life." The book that reveals their error says: "He that has the Son of God has the life." What, we may ask, is most characteristic of seed sown? Is it not the coincidence and conflict of life and death in the same kernel, in which life gets the mastery, although even then death gets his share? Our apostle well understood this struggle, as Rom. vi. 3, 4, 2 Cor. iv. 10-16, and Phil. iii. 10, 11, clearly reveal; in fact he was so thoroughly familiar with it, as were his readers too, that he could safely throw the truth out of form for a moment, and exclaim with an almost playful irony: "So then death worketh in us, but life in you!" In point of fact, both life and death were working in them all. All had received Christ. All had gone down into his grave to be planted together with him in the likeness of his death—some "in weakness," with fear and trembling, distrusting themselves in view of the daily putting to death of the Lord Jesus which they would have to bear; some in all the "dishonour" that a Christ-hating world could cover them with; all in the "corruption" of their death-doomed flesh; all with "psychical bodies," in the hope of their one day becoming "pneumatical" or spiritual. Yes, all, as sons of the kingdom, having in them the life of the kingdom, had been sown for immortality. The seed sown must have in it the life of the seed reaped. Regeneration is the starting point for resurrection in the image of Christ. (7) But what are we to say of the piled-up illustrations of verses 39 to 41? If we imitate Mr. Maude, and once begin to force those illustrations into an individual application to the subject in hand, we may not stop where he would wish us. Instead of being content to go with him to sun and moon and stars in search of materials for our bodies, we may ignobly lapse into birds and beasts and fishes! In all seriousness, we must not begrudge the apostle his revel in the Divine storehouse of forms and types and hints of unnumbered possibilities. Suffice it that we understand him to have lavished his wealth of symbols on a worthy thought. In giving the body that pleases him, God will be in no straits. To every saint he will give "an appropriate body;" and *therefore* the body of a "man" (v. 39), *therefore* a heavenly body arrayed with a heavenly kind (ἕτερα) of glory (v. 40), *therefore* a glory of a precisely suitable individual (ἄλλη) degree (v. 41). IN THIS WAY THEN—viz., of the right species, with the proper kind of lustre, and that in the exact degree—will be the resurrection of the dead saints as they come forth; some with peculiarities of "honour," some with specialties of "power," all with incorruptible bodies, all with spiritual bodies.

Digitized by Google

*B. The two Bodies and the two Adams*, verses 44 to 49. Man is the only being now before us—birds, beasts, and fishes having been dismissed; but man may be viewed in two stages of embodiment, the psychical and the pneumatical,—or, in plain, if scarcely classic words, the soulical and the spiritual. There *are*, APPROPRIATE TO MAN, these two kinds of body: no more. Of each of these two kinds of human body we have a single exemplar, from which there is no departure. The type of the first body is given in Adam, of the second in Christ. Christ is the last man: there is nothing beyond him—no *third* type. In the first type, the *psyche* is permitted to take the lead: to conform the body and characterise the man. In the second, the *pneuma* takes the lead; in turn *it* conforms the body, *it* characterises the man. And so it is written—partly by Moses, partly by Paul:—"The first man, Adam, became a living *psyche*—soul: the last Adam, a *pneuma*, or spirit, giving life." The first Adam did not become an unembodied soul; neither did the second Adam become a disembodied spirit. Spiritual and immaterial are not here synonymous. Spiritual no more means made of spirit than psychical means made of soul. The spirit-body of the heavenly man is just as truly a BODY as the soul-body of the earthy man. With a difference? Of course, with a difference; but what? The psychical body is of earthy substance, of gross materialism: the spiritual body is of heavenly substance, of refined materialism. It should be well observed that, in verse 47, the same preposition is twice used in precisely the same way—both times to denote *origin of bodily substance*: the first man is *ek*, OF earth, earthy; the second is *ek* (ex=ek), OF heaven—and therefore heavenly. But that is not first that is heavenly. Can a reason be assigned for this? We believe a very good reason can be given: it is because the heavenly is a growth out of the earthy; by the energy of a heavenly birth the body of the spirit springs forth out of the body of the soul. Therefore we *must* first bear the image of the earthy Adam, before we can bear the image of the heavenly Adam. Bearing—not by our own choice—the image of the first, it is then our duty and privilege to *go on* to bear the image of the second; which consideration makes way for the hortatory form of the text as adopted, from the best authorities, by both Tischendorf and Tregelles: "LET us also bear the image of the heavenly One!" It is, further, most important to perceive that even Christ our Lord had a psychical body before he could, in due course as man, have a spiritual body. His present spiritual body is, it is true, as we have just seen, of heavenly substance; nevertheless that substance was derived from his earthy, psychical body. In all things he was made like unto his brethren, and therefore in this. The last Adam had for a while to bear the image of the first. The body of his humiliation was of earth; it was the body of his soul. By orderly development, out of that body was produced the body of his spirit. We would speak with the greatest reverence, but so we believe it to have been. We believe that the whole scheme of corporeal reconstruction suited to man was exemplarily instanced in Christ. His spirit was life because of righteousness. In him the sowing and raising were fulfilled. He was buried in the Jordan into a life-long conformity to his own coming death. The power of his resurrection was anticipated. The heavens were opened to him. The Spirit from above

Digitized by Google

came upon him and anointed him. Thenceforth, in an especial sense, (and perhaps this is the very sense of the wonderful word ὁ ὤν, John iii. 13) his being was in heaven. When the time for his transformation on the mount came, he was ready for it: when his resurrection came, he was ready. By his transformation he became corporeally of heaven for a little while: by his resurrection he became corporeally of heaven for ever. And yet, even then (after his resurrection), at will he could conform himself to earth, and reveal himself to mortal eyes, and display to his friends the sacred glory-scars of his cross and passion. He did not materialise himself at will, but he rendered his essentially heavenly materialism visible and tangible at will. His corporeal substance was not fluctuating and dependent on outward conditions, needing to take this or that from any life-sphere; but was absolutely free, and independent of particular locality; always, moreover, carrying within it the essential acquisitions of its previous psychical state. And it is his image we are exhorted to bear. It would even seem that we are to be capable of conferring life on others; though here as yet we seem to be in lack of collateral evidence even from the Scriptures (unless, indeed, there are unrecognised hints of this in "Ephesians" and elsewhere?). Yet surely *it must be so*; or how could we—minus so essential and prominent a characteristic of the second Adam—be said to bear his image? Whereas, with such a triumphant token of conformity to his likeness, we can see how really and regally we shall, not merely enter into the kingdom, but as "joint-heirs" "inherit" it. And for such a position, need we wonder that "flesh and blood" are declared to be incompetent? "But this I am saying"—about the first and the second man, the soulical and the spiritual body—"BECAUSE (ὅτι) flesh and blood," &c. The apostle would satisfy us that our royalty will be efficiently sustained in the power and glory of our PERSONS; so that, for example, we shall be able with dignity to employ on our royal errands messengers of winged swiftness and flaming splendour, severally greater in power and might than serried ranks of earth-born men in arms. *Decaying* "flesh" and *renovating* "blood" will have no place in the heavenly bodies of the brothers of the King. We are ready to say: "Thank you, beloved brother Paul, we are satisfied: you had well divined our modesty, our hesitancy, our embarrassment; now our fears on that head are gone;—if we are only found meet for such an inheritance, such a weight of glory!"

A new question arises. If flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom—if our royal bodies are to be so new, so glorious—if, in short, it would seem to be necessary to *die* to get them; what shall be done for those believers who are in their bodies of flesh and blood when the kingdom comes? Must they in haste disrobe, in order to put on the royal apparel of a heavenly materialism? The answer is given in—

*C. The Mystery*, verses 51 to 54. This sacred disclosure removes the difficulty. In lively ideality and fervent hope identifying himself with the number, the apostle virtually says: No: not even for a little shall we need to be put to sleep; the gain of dying without its pain will be ours: indeed, *for us*, a very special triumph waits, a triumph fitly signalising the arrival of him who is not the Resurrection only but the Life:—at the sound of his messenger's trumpet, "this mortal," says the apostle, as if laying his hand on his breast, shall in a moment clothe itself with

Digitized by Google

immortality; the soulical, earthly body, the disqualifying flesh and blood will be no more, will be lost in the heavenly materialism which alone will thenceforth for ever remain. Passing by every other point of interest therein, we would merely observe how clearly this paragraph prepares the reader for the remarkable supplement to this resurrection chapter which is supplied in the second epistle (iv.-v.). (1) In the "corruptible" of verses 53, 54, we anticipate the "corrupting" of 2 Cor. iv. 16; and in "this mortal" of verses 53, 54, the "what is mortal" of 2 Cor. v. 4. (2) In the "clothe itself" of verse 53, we have the germ of the "clothe ourselves over" of 2 Cor. 2, 4.* (3) In the assurance that we shall "not all sleep" of verse 51, we have a distinct justification both of the uncertainty whether or no the "tent-dwelling" will "come down" which is evident in 2 Cor. v. 1, and also of the hope of transformation rather than resurrection which animates 2 Cor. v. 4. (4) In the abstract nouns, "incorruptibility," "immortality," here used (verses 53, 54) we have an admirable preparation—though, at the same time, only a preparation—for the concrete nouns, "building," "dwelling," and (implied in the verb) "robe" described in the second epistle as "age-abiding," "of heaven," and possessing the power of "life itself."

JOSEPH B. ROTHERHAM.

# CORRESPONDENCE.

## THE BEGINNING OF THE END.

DEAR SIR,—Conscious of your desire to avoid any merely sensational matter in your columns, and commending you for the same, I yet venture to request the favour, conditionally as below, of your publishing the following suggestions and remarks concerning the prospect of the approaching end of this dispensation. Eschewing all chronological dates, enigmatical numbers, and the like, as utterly worthless until the actual commencement of the end, or until the knowledge of a seven years' compact with the partially restored Jews, and which is not yet, I rely solely on the word of prophecy.

For many years I have been satisfied that our only guide to a knowledge of the nearness of the end is to be found in the facts of the predicted signs; many of which, that is of the general signs, have been plainly visible for some time past; but I wish now to draw the attention of your readers to an historic fact, realising a most clearly predicted event; and which, if followed shortly by the realisation of a subsequent event predicted with equal clearness, will place the watchful ones in possession of a full and complete knowledge of coming events onwards to the end, which, in that case, cannot be two decades of years distant. The Book of Daniel is very precious to the student of prophecy, but the eleventh chapter has been a recog-

* With differences which, when examined, resolve themselves into a closer resemblance. For, since "this mortal"—which is itself a garment—clothes itself with immortality, what is this but the wearer of the first putting on a second garment over it?—the very conception of the second epistle.

Digitized by Google

nised difficulty with everybody. How much is past, and how much remains to be fulfilled, are questions that multitudes would rejoice to see solved. Some writers place the break between the fourth and sixth verses, others between the twentieth and twenty-first verses. If we could point absolutely to the division between the past and the future, we should indicate the present, or, what is the same thing, if we could trace current history in that chapter of Daniel we could draw the line dividing all the past from all the future. Now that is exactly what I think it probable may be done. At every re-opening of the Eastern Question there have been sensational writers predicting the immediate end, and that without, in my estimation, the least reliable evidence of the fact, they generally relying on the figurative drying up of the Euphrates, whereas *the literal drying up of the river Euphrates* is one of the final events, not one of the first events, of the latter-day troubles.

The present war has led me to search the prophet Daniel afresh, to see if any real, unquestionable, evidence may be found indicating the end in current events; and my first object was, if possible, to find the "break," for there only could it be found, if found at all. For that purpose I ran forwards from the commencement of the chapter, and backwards from the end many times over. The former portion I found fulfilled in history, and the latter portion occupied with the future history of a line of kings—three in number only—the last being the Antichrist; and the account of the whole occupying from verse sixteen to the end of the chapter. I am aware of the usual supposition that the sixteenth verse refers to the previously mentioned king of the north; but I cannot believe it does, because it should be beyond all question this wilful king is immediately followed "in the glory of the kingdom" by the "raiser of taxes;" and he, in his turn, by the "vile person." It is an unbroken line to the end, and there are but three. If, then, the first be a king of the north, so must also the other two be kings of the north; but the last is opposed to the king of the north; therefore the wilful king of the sixteenth verse cannot be the king of the north.

The kings of the north and south formerly were two of Alexander's successors. It is not so now. The king of the north of the latter days is certainly Russia (see Ezek.). And the present king of the south, holding territory formerly occupied by both north and south, is Turkey. If it be not so, then are we far enough from the end beyond contradiction—not within generations, if centuries even.

And now for the break. It is found in the thirteenth verse. There "after certain years" the king of the north comes "with a great army and much riches (substance)." He comes at a time when "many stand up against the king of the south" (ver. 14); and takes all "the most fenced cities" (ver. 15), while the south has "no strength to withstand." If Russia, then, be the king of the north, and Turkey the king of the south, we have a most clear fulfilment of prediction, and an unmistakable commencement of the latter day troubles; and we may expect that England's interference, now imminent on behalf of Turkey (though really for her own sake), will be found of no avail, for "neither shall his (the king of the south's) chosen people" be able to withstand. The British power

Digitized by Google

which has long propped up Turkey can alone be the power referred to here. But the event to follow, and which absolutely will settle the question of the beginning of the end, is a fruitless effort on the part of "the children of the destroyers" of Daniel's people (see Young's translation), that is the Romans, now the Italians, to establish the vision, whatever that may be. Who the three successive kings may be of the Antichristian line I do not pretend to know; but I have an idea they are the last three of the "seven kings" of Rev. xvii., the last of whom "continues a short space," as does the last of Daniel's kings—the inference being in Revelation that the penultimate king does not continue any length of time, as, in Daniel, he is said to continue only a "few days."

Should Russia be driven back by England, or should Italy not seek, almost immediately, "to establish the vision," then, sir, don't burden your pages with these conjectures; but, on the contrary, should Russia hold her own against England and others, and should Italy make the move I anticipate, then, in the name of the Lord, I implore you give my thoughts the fullest utterance in your power; for then the end is very close, and I can map out the whole of the future unerringly in consecutive order.

B. Cass.

Christchurch, N. Z.

## LITERATURE.

*The Way to Zion.* A Series of Pulpit Addresses. By John Dawson Hull, B.A., Vicar of Wickhambrook, Suffolk. London: Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday.

Mr. Hull's object is to give "a clear and connected presentation of the several parts" of the Gospel. With this view, of course, the sermons embrace a wide field of doctrinal truth and practical piety. They are evangelical in sentiment, earnest in tone, and clear in expression. As the preacher is a poet, he often expresses his thoughts felicitously; but his aim is higher than literary excellence; he wishes to be instrumental in saving sinners, and to strengthen the love of Christians to their Redeemer. Christ is conspicuous in Mr. Hull's sermons, and therefore we wish for them extensive usefulness.

*Sixty Anglo-Israel Difficulties Answered.* Chiefly from the correspondence of the late John Wilson. Compiled by his Daughter. London: S. W. Partridge & Co.

Increasing attention is being paid to the question, whence sprang this "imperial race," the English people? No one has answered this question with greater clearness and calmness than the late John Wilson. There is considerable repetition in Miss Wilson's compilation, a thing which could not be avoided in solving so many difficulties. We heartily commend the book. It is only 2s., or cloth 2s. 6d.

*A Manual of Prayers* for Family Worship. By C. C. P. London: Elliot Stock.

These prayers cover four weeks, if only one a day is used. There is

Digitized by Google

a tone of harmony between the prayer and the passage of Scripture which precedes it. The book may prove a devotional help to some who need it; but the sooner such helps are laid aside for prayer in words which the Holy Spirit breathes, the better.

*The Biblical Museum.* London: Elliot Stock.

This very useful book for reference and illustration has reached its third Old Testament volume, containing notes on Joshua to second Samuel inclusive. We have in previous notices characterised Mr. Comper Gray's work; and as this volume is on the same plan as its predecessors nothing further need be said, except that such persevering labour in a good cause deserves encouragement.

*Eternal Punishment.* A Critique on Canon Farrar's "Eternal Hope." London: Norgate, Covent Garden.

This critique is of little critical value. Its central thought is revealed in the sentence, "The Canon utterly fails in showing that future punishment is not eternal," the writer, of course, meaning that eternal punishment is eternal suffering. As long as the dismal school clings to this gross falsehood there is no hope of opening their eyes to the truth. Scripture, for which they profess such reverence, tells them that by punishment it means loss of being, destruction, *death;* but no, they have a tradition from the dark ages, and, revolting as it is, they like it. It is strange, it is distressing that the word of God should be so greatly misunderstood. Even the amiable Philip Doddridge could pen this atrocious couplet:—

"In flames that no abatement know,
Though briny tears for ever flow."

Everlasting punishment is inflicted by human law whenever a murderer is executed. The result of the execution is literally everlasting. By no possibility can men restore the life which they have taken away. They have done that which cannot be undone. We believe firmly in "everlasting punishment"—it is clearly a doctrine of Scripture—but not in everlasting suffering, for there is not a word in the Bible in favour of that unspeakably horrible thought.

*The World's final Throes.* By Alpha. London: W. Poole.

This is a rhapsody, of which we can make nothing.

*Turkey, Russia, England, and the Jews.* A Lecture. By Alfred Pickles. London: Elliot Stock.

Mr. Pickles has said some sensible things, but he has not shed fresh light on the situation.

## NOTICE.

The Rainbow for Distribution.—In answer to applicants for copies of the Rainbow for distribution, the Publisher has arranged to supply *one dozen sorted back numbers at one-third of their value, viz. at 2s. per dozen.* Those desirous of promoting the truths upheld in the Rainbow are requested to apply to the Publisher early, as a very limited number of copies are available for this purpose at this rate.

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

AUGUST, 1878.

## THE BRIGHT SIDE OF PROPHECY.

IT is one of the characteristics of prophecy that even its darkest scenes are heralds of light; its storms precede a calm; its judgments on ungodly nations are parts of the process by which eventually righteousness will cover the earth; and its destruction of the Antichrist and his allies prepares the way for the universal reign of the Prince of Peace. This is God's mode of working, and it is worthy of his infinite wisdom and goodness. He has in view the final and permanent establishment of truth and peace in the world, and the means by which he will realise his ultimate purpose are perfectly adapted to the end in view. It is not enough to say that the loyal will adore him for the glorious issue when it has been reached; they will also, in reviewing the process which secured the issue, say, "This also came forth from the Lord of hosts, who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working."

Sometimes we find predictions so exquisitely beautiful, and clothed in language of such regal splendour that even the most vigorous faith is conscious of doubt. A mental glance at the state of the world and the Church shows that both come immeasurably short of the divine picture with which the prophet has fired our hearts; and so the question comes, in lying serpent fashion, How is this picture to become a fact? The old notion—child of human pride and ignorance—that *we* are a necessary factor in the divine operations, starts up in its usual vanity, and because we are not so useful in the service of heaven as we should be, God's prophets fondly described a state of things which will never come to pass, and the God of the prophets made promises which he is unable to fulfil! If Christian people would only put the misgiving suggestion that troubles them in so many words thus, they would be ashamed of themselves and ask pardon of the Father. With him all things promised are virtually accomplished. *He knows what*



Digitized by Google

*he means to do, and he will do exactly what he means.* He may use us, and if he does it will be a supreme honour; but it would be just as well if governments and ecclesiastical confederacies distinctly understood that he can do without them.

But we are not left to the mercy of argument or inference for a reply to our question. The Lord understands us thoroughly, and so he has graciously anticipated our doubts and misgivings by an answer which, though couched in a few simple words, is positively wonderful for its depth of meaning: "*The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.*" If we were dealing with rationalistic scepticism, we would say, earnestly: Now marshal all your doubts, and put in battle array all your misgivings and improbabilities, and when you have got your army in the best possible position, see if it can face that grand oracle of the Most High without quailing. "The zeal of the Lord of Hosts" is engaged to accomplish all his beneficent designs regarding our world, and they will be accomplished, all your proud reasonings to the contrary notwithstanding. But we do not write for men of this class at present. There are believers of the Gospel of Christ who have been trained in a very narrow school of thought, which has led them to the conception that unfulfilled prophecy is simply inexplicable mystery; or that, stripping off the "oriental imagery," all that is meant is some spiritual blessing which the missions of the Church will carry to the nations. In other words, they "spiritualise," and so neutralise, some of the grandest prophecies of the seers of Israel and Judah, and commit to the hands of men deeds which cannot be accomplished without supernatural power.

And, be it observed, this dread of supernaturalism—for *that* is the heart of the matter—is extremely inconsistent on the part of Christian men. All that they believe of the truths of the Gospel is founded upon the supernatural. But for divine intervention they could have had no Gospel, no Saviour, no hope of eternal life. The Gospel narratives are the history of the miraculous; and it may be, nay it is certain, that there will be divine intervention again in the affairs of the world before it can be transformed into the splendid paradise which the bright side of prophecy makes it. Let sceptics scoff at the supernatural if it so please them, but for believers in the incarnation of the Son of God and his resurrection from the dead to do so is at once inconsistent, absurd, and sinful. Alas! good men stand in the way of God's truth more than bad men. Of course they do not mean it for a moment, but the fact is nevertheless true that the mournful ignorance of many true Christians respecting the contents of the Divine Book has hindered the testimony of faithful witnesses to the three grand doctrines of the book—that eternal life is the gift of God in Christ, that the Church is the body of Christ, and that the entire world is the destined kingdom of Christ. The teachers of these magnificent truths—few in number, and generally poor and despised—are in harmony with prophets

Digitized by Google

and apostles, and, of course, with the Lord of both; but the spiritualising, that is to say the neutralising majority will not hear them, and so the bright side of prophecy is covered with fog, and the benign purpose of God respecting the world is unknown.

It is in the Book in many a glowing paragraph, radiant with the light and love of heaven; but the innate dislike to the supernatural of men who owe everything to the supernatural, has suggested metaphor or parable where neither exists; and thus the "glorious things which are spoken" of the city and throne of the Lord on Mount Zion, and of the entire world under his beneficent reign, through the executive ministry of his "princes"—those members of the Church which are fitted for this high service—are hidden from view as a magnificent landscape is sometimes concealed by a dense fog. Nevertheless it is all there, and when the fog is dispersed by the power of the sun the entranced spectator will behold it in its beauty. So, whether the teachers of Christendom are fit for their work or not, the day is coming "when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously;" and "the name of the city from that day shall be THE LORD IS THERE." ED.

---

## IDOLATRY.

MOST thoughtful persons will admit that the design of Christianity is to permeate and elevate all the actions of human life. Others go farther, and believe that Christianity can accomplish this without assuming any external shape, that its influence should be felt rather than seen, and that even its aggressive advance were best secured by individual effort; and is in fact sorely crippled by the favourite stratagem of charging in phalanxes.

But this is far from being the commonly accepted belief even among Protestants. Religion, they contend, in order to maintain any practicable front, must be recognised as a symmetrical system, an integral entity, distinct from ordinary life. It must have its visible corporations, its public proclamations of faith, its official standard-bearers, its temples of worship, and its chair of logic. It must present a fair position in population-statistics, and must be content, like all other civil institutions, to repose beneath the ægis of the constable's staff. Without this vast machinery to keep the concern going, it is believed that the very faith of Jesus would collapse and vanish amid worldly influences. This is the honest persuasion of many: and, so long as it is honest, it is not to be condemned. But the object of this essay is rather to inquire how far any of us may be chargeable with Idolatry who cling to this old machinery from a very different motive, whose dread of spiritual Christianity is based upon cowardice or indolence. "Condemnable



Digitized by Google

Idolatry," as Thomas Carlyle has stated it, "is insincere idolatry." So long as the heart of the Fetish-worshipper is honestly filled with his Fetish; that is to say, "if he entirely believe in his Fetish, it will then be, I should say, if not well with him, yet as well as it can readily be made to be; and you will leave him alone, unmolested there." (*The Hero as Priest.*) The culpable and calamitous stage in the man's experience, against which the prophets have in all ages made implacable war, is reached when the Fetish having become incredible, the man yet clings to it, when he tries to cast anchor in what he half suspects to be quicksand, and hugs it as the only refuge against being cast adrift or drowning in a sea of conjecture. "This," continues our modern Iconoclast, "is one of the balefulest sights. Souls are no longer filled with their Fetish; but only pretend to be filled, and would fain make themselves feel that they are filled. 'You do not believe,' said Coleridge; 'you only believe that you believe.' It is the final scene in all kinds of worship and symbolism, the sure symptom that death is now nigh. It is equivalent to what we call formulism and worship of formulas in these days of ours. No more immoral act can be done by a human creature, for it is the beginning of all immorality; or rather it is the impossibility henceforth of any morality whatsoever. The innermost moral soul is paralysed thereby, cast into fatal magnetic sleep. Men are no longer sincere men. I do not wonder that the earnest man denounces this, brands it, prosecutes it with inextinguishable aversion. He and it, all good and it, are at death-feud."—*Ibid.*

These are terrible words. Now let us see where they hit. Do they not seem to define and declare the sin of Idolatry as with a sunbeam? Putting popish and pagan idols out of court, is not Idolatry simply the displacement of spiritual worship by symbolism of any kind, whether bearing the form of public services, or creeds, or church organisation; and attributing to them a sacramental energy? But the flagrancy of the sin lies in endeavouring to keep the rickety formula on its legs after the Prophet has arisen, and in the name of God commanded us to cast it into the fire. Priests and people thereupon hysterically struggle to keep the Idol enthroned. They have long been deluding one another by the mutual infusion of soporific poison into the notion that religious duty, that is to say ecclesiastical duty, is the highest form of duty, and that the common charities of life acquire a fairer and diviner form when directed by the ecclesiastical finger. But the prophet has told them that this is an imposture, and they half suspect he is right. Nay, he has assured them that what is commonly understood by religious duty, so far from being the highest, is the very lowest and the most corrupt, having a fatal tendency to degenerate into no duty at all, but into a very demoralising and debasing act. It is an attempt to rest where God has declared, "Arise and depart, for this is not your rest, it is polluted;" it is a determination to "lie among the

Digitized by Google

pots" when the bugle has summoned every individual man to take the kingdom by violence. The orthodox or mediæval delusions in which we and our fathers were nursed, covered and apologised for many practices and modes of thought which are now seen to be untenable. The ant-hill being overturned, the frantic natives, exposed to intolerable light, are eddying in conflicting circles, tumbling over one another, and each carrying a large prayer-book in his mouth. Oh that the ant-hill would again cover us and shroud us in the comfortable darkness in which we dwelt of old! But no, my friend, it cannot be. We must advance when the prophet points the way. No need just now to declare who the prophet is, or to say whether he inhabits a cave and wears a hairy shirt, or whether his name be Legion. He hath spoken: let that suffice. The fifty thousand pulpits of England have vibrated to the spell of his voice; and now the Archbishop of Canterbury and Charles Spurgeon may scream their wildest duet, and say to the winds, "Peace, be still;" but the day of rest has passed away for ever. With a few gallant exceptions, they were all silent when they should have spoken. Now the chorus is discord.

Men have discovered, as by a shock, what a natural affinity exists between a false psychology and ecclesiastical forms. Like the touch of Ithuriel's spear, which compelled the toad squatting at the ear of Eve to start into its own hideous reality, the revived doctrine of Immortality in Christ has laid bare the very heart of priestcraft both in its practitioners and in its victims. It must surely have been little short of a prophetic ecstasy which presented this figure to the mind of John Milton. And are we not now living in the day of its fulfilment? There is nothing so cordially hated by the modern worshippers of idols as this doctrine of Life in Christ; and yet there is nothing which more absolutely saturates the Bible-message from first to last.

Who that watches the current of public thought can doubt that there is a vehement struggle going on to reinstate some one or more of the fallen deities of Palestine? If not

"Moloch, thrice horrid god, besmeared with blood,"

then let it be the god of Ekron, or perchance some nondescript dæmon from the hill of Samaria. But the Son of David must be encountered at all hazards, say they. Either the light must be veiled or the people's seven senses must be bewitched. It is daily becoming more manifest that "the conspiracy of silence" will no longer avail; and as we cannot just yet afford to let judgment go by default, what weapon can so well serve our purpose as the old mephitic wind-bag of Origen? It carries about it an odour of balm which sufficiently disguises its true action; and if it have no tornado-power it may at least serve to suffocate. And thus the experiment is now in process of fermentation, and its professors are again on trial as they were in the third century. It was this demonstration

Digitized by Google

which gave birth to Mr. Spurgeon's sermon on "The Effeminate God" of modern theology; a God which he declared was well-fitted and adapted for the effeminate men who had constructed him. Let the cap fit whom it may. (It is true, by the way, that effeminate men may also be found among those who affect to believe in the eternal torment of their fellow creatures; but let that pass.) But it is a very great mistake to confound the Unitarian God with him who said, "Those mine enemies who would not that I should reign over them, bring them hither and slay them before me." There was nothing effeminate about "the great and terrible God" who, Moses taught, would destroy his enemies in a moment, though he might not come quite up to the standard of ferocity requisite for ensuring the homage of St. Augustine.

But though the people have at last risen in stern revolt against the reign of Moloch, great is the reluctance to declare openly and unequivocally for the God of Israel; for it is felt to be a step in advance from which there is no retreat. Whatever may be said about the virtuous capacities of the heathen who know not God, what shall we say of those teachers who endeavour to make it appear that it is possible to be a good man without being a Christian? Is it not because the further unwelcome suspicion has been awakened in various quarters that the Christianity of the New Testament involves the renunciation of mediæval Christianity? At the lifting of this dread curtain the affrighted worshippers start back. Flesh and blood recoil from the ordeal; and the *quasi* Christian rites in which they formerly found consolation are again enshrined with enhanced splendour. It were folly, they say, to forsake the old paths which our forefathers trod; may we not, like them, reach the pearly gates by the practice of docility, and thus be spared the protracted torture of untried mountain-heights? In plain speech: may we not still profess and call ourselves Christians without quite accepting the historical evidence of our Lord's resurrection, or recognising in our own persons the claims of the resurrection-life? May we not come together, as of old, and sing psalms, and give alms, and buy the last edition of our pastor's "Discourses," and limit our faith by his Directory: give an æsthetic touch to our worship, but be permitted to shut our ears to every disturbing foreign influence? There is but one reply: "Little children, keep yourselves from idols."

J. WAYLEN.

---

## DR. PARKER ON IMMORTALITY.

(*Concluded from page* 311.)

THE second very important point on which we feel constrained to differ from Dr. Parker is in his conception—if indeed that can be called a conception which cannot be conceived—of man's

Digitized by Google

relation to eternity. In reference to this he writes as follows: "First of all, in endeavouring to reach the divine meaning of 'for ever' I must remind you that 'for ever' is *not an arithmetical term*, and therefore it is not arithmetically intelligible. I do not know that imagination sooner succumbs than in its attempts to realise Eternity, perhaps not even in its attempts to realise God, for therein the Spirit itself helpeth our infirmities. Arithmetic is profanely out of place along the whole line of this inquiry. The moment men begin to think of immortality they begin to expand the multiplication-table, and thus they bring together two things that are absolutely without any legitimate mutual relation. When the popular mind (why need I except the philosophical?) endeavours to realise eternity, it seizes upon some time-unit, say a day, and imaginatively increases it by years, ages, and millenniums, until it loses itself in a bewildering accumulation of myriads of centuries. This is a fatal blunder. The whole imagination is irrational and useless. Eternity is not amplified time any more than time is contracted eternity. Abandoning, therefore, the arithmetical conception of 'immortal,' 'eternal,' 'for ever,' and all other terms in the same series, as an instrument wholly unequal to the occasion—as demonstrably and palpably unequal—I must look elsewhere for a definition. Does the expression 'for ever' answer to anything that is *in myself?* Does it express a desire or sensation for which I have been unable to find a satisfactory word? Is there something *in* me that answers the term like an echo? I believe there is. That something is the assertion—alas, how blurred by sin!—of God's design and purpose in my creation: it is my immortality stretching out in piteous and speechless yearning towards God's eternity, as a lost child might answer his father's voice in a night dark and wild. The term 'for ever' expresses completeness, thoroughness, absoluteness, and not any mood or phase of time as time is arithmetically knowable. That there will be judgment and penalty after death is distinctly revealed. If there are terms which seem to indicate arithmetically the everlasting consciousness and misery of the wicked, there are also terms which as plainly indicate the absolute cessation of their being. On the one hand you may quote 'punishment,' 'torment,' and 'fire that is not quenched,' but on the other you have to explain 'devoured,' 'consumed,' 'destroyed,' 'perished,' 'dead,'—terms which are uttterly inconsistent with any arithmetical interpretation of 'for ever.' My answer to your inquiry is, that 'for ever' is a symbol for the Unknowable; that 'for ever,' as a mood of Time, can have no relation to moral questions; and that in thinking of 'for ever,' as involving moral penalties, you must interpret it as meaning 'complete,' 'absolute,' 'equitable,' 'final:' in this sense it covers the whole moral necessity, it exactly expresses the consequence of moral guilt, and it escapes all the perils and even absurdities of arithmetical computation." (Lecture I.)

Digitized by Google

In adopting this line of argument Dr. Parker, we regret to say, does not stand alone; though no one else, so far as we are aware, has ventured to eliminate the element of time altogether. Mr. Cox in his admirable book, *Salvator Mundi* writes thus: "The word 'eternal' bears two great meanings, and is used in two very different senses. Popularly and loosely it is used to denote that which lasts for ever; but as it is used by many of our most eminent thinkers and theologians, instead of denoting that which endures through all the successions of time, it denotes that which is *above and beyond* time, that which is independent of duration; that which you can no more calculate on the sequences of time than you can weigh music by the pound, or measure beauty with a foot-rule."* And so Canon Farrar in his *Eternal Hope:* "The word αἰώνιος, sometimes translated 'everlasting,' is simply the word which, in its first sense, means *agelong* or *æonian;* and which is in the Bible itself applied to things which have utterly and long since passed away; and is in its second sense something 'spiritual,' —something above and beyond time,—as when the knowledge of God is said to be eternal life. So that when with your futile billions you foist into this word αἰώνιος the fiction of endless time, you do but give the lie to the mighty oath of that great angel, who set one foot upon the sea, and one upon the land, and with hand uplifted to heaven sware by him who liveth for ever and ever that 'Time should be no more.'" (Rev. x. 7.) †

Now, we at once concede that when the reference is to abstract moral qualities, or, indeed, to any thing lying within the *Divine* sphere, this secondary *ethical* sense of the word "eternal" is perfectly correct, legitimate, and even scriptural. In this sense it denotes the inherent and unchangeable character and quality—or, to use Dr. Parker's words, the completeness, thoroughness, absoluteness, of that to which it is applied, and does not even touch the question of its duration. This meaning of the word admits of ready illustration by the properties of physical things. Thus the chemist tells us that oxygen—one of the constituents of our atmosphere—is a great supporter of combustion, and this property of oxygen we may, in the same sense, call the eternal law of oxygen. It is thus that we must understand the word "eternal" or "everlasting" (αἰώνιος) when it is applied to moral or spiritual things: it denotes their essential *quality* not their definite or indefinite *quantity*. When we say that it is the eternal property of the gas oxygen to be a supporter of combustion, we are not speaking of oxygen in connection with time either long or short; supposing oxygen should cease to exist in the universe, we could still speak of it in the same way, and affirm that to be a supporter of combustion was its eternal property; for we should not be speaking of oxygen as existing at

* Page 97. † Pp. 78, 79.

Digitized by Google

any particular time, but merely describing one of its essential qualities wherever it does exist.

Now, just so, the essential and unchangeable antagonism of God's nature and character to sin is an eternal property or quality in God; and, consequently, his judgment or punishment,—by which we simply mean the necessary and evitable, not the arbitrarily connected, consequences of sin,—must rest eternally upon it and upon the man who is the servant of sin, alike in this world and in every other; it also is eternal. This, however, does not really touch the question of what the duration of future punishment may be; that depends on altogether different considerations; namely, on the moral character and essential nature of the sinner. Moral character is not, *per se*, an unchangeable and eternal quality in the creature; if it were so the salvation of any fallen creature would seem to be an impossibility, or rather perhaps we should say, no creature created upright could ever fall. So long, indeed, as any being who is evil shall remain evil, so long must he continue to endure the consequences of the Divine antagonism to sin: but whether he will remain evil as long as he exists, depends not on the fact that the Divine judgment and punishment of sin is and must be eternal, but on the perpetuity of his moral character. Even if it could be demonstrated, on other grounds, that the moral character of any human being here or hereafter was absolutely fixed and unalterable, it would not follow that his punishment must be unending, unless it could also be demonstrated, independently, that his nature was essentially and absolutely immortal.

That this ethical sense of the word "eternal" as distinguished from "everlasting"—Dr. Parker appears rather to confuse the two—is scriptural as well as philosophical, we may learn from St. Paul's use of it in 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18: "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh out for us a far more exceeding and eternal (αἰώνιον) weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal (αἰώνια)." Now, if we regard the word "eternal" in this passage as intended to denote *never-ending*, then the statement of the Apostle is manifestly erroneous; for among "the things which are not seen"—even restricting this denomination to such promised things as fall within the vision of Christian hope—must be included some things which plainly enough *shall have an end*; as, *e.g.*, the Paradise of the intermediate state, which ends in the resurrection glory; the binding of Satan for the millennial period, and even the kingdom of heaven in its Messianic phase, which is, at "the end" to be "delivered up to God even the Father." We are bound, therefore, to understand the word "eternal," as here used by the Apostle Paul, to express the essential character rather than the indefinite duration of those "things unseen" at which we are to look or aim. And this conclusion is confirmed by our Lord's

Digitized by Google

words in John xvii. 3: "And this is life eternal (literally 'the eternal life') to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." For to attempt to interpret these words as meaning, "this is the indispensable condition—the essential antecedent—of the attainment of future never-ending life," is most distinctly to evade their plain grammatical force and meaning, which is, that the knowledge of the one true God and his Christ is that *wherein* the eternal life—impersonally considered—consists as to its essence and principle.

All this notwithstanding, we venture to lay it down as an exegetical rule—to which we are unaware of there being any exception: that *whenever in the Scriptures either the substantive* αἰών *or the adjective* αἰώνιος *is used with reference to the existence of the creature*—whether man or angel—*or in any connection involving such creaturely existence, the concept of measurable*—we do not say measured—*duration is never absent.* In truth, time is nothing else than the creature's relation to eternity: we can no more conceive of the creature existing either nowhere or nowhen, than we can of its existing everywhere or everywhen. To suppose the creature to exist everywhere and everywhen, would be to suppose it to fill immensity and inhabit eternity, in other words it would be to invest the finite with the attributes of the Infinite; and, on the other hand, to regard it as existing nowhere or nowhen would be practically to annihilate it, or at all events to render its existence unthinkable. If we may compare Eternity, in the abstract, to the dial-plate of a clock, with its graduated hour-figures; then while the Divine relation to eternity might be illustrated by supposing there were twelve hands pointing simultaneously to each hour-figure, the creature's relation thereto must be represented by a single hand which moves slowly from one figure to another, ever having passed one and approached another. In other words, while with God it can never be said to be one o'clock any more than three or six, with the creature it can be six o'clock only when it is past five and before it is seven.

The essential difference, then, between the concepts of eternity and time upon which Dr. Parker seems to insist, we are quite prepared to acknowledge, if only eternity be understood as the mode of the *Divine* existence, whereas time is the mode of the *creature's* existence. True it is, that in Scripture, by a necessary illusion, God is frequently represented as acting under the creaturely limitation of time; but, on the other hand, the creature is never regarded as lost, or to be lost, in that measureless permanence of Divine existence to which we give the name of eternity. Time, in its relation to the creature can, we are bold to say, never come to a close, but must continue as long as creation itself continues. Hence the future existence of men—even of saved and glorified men—is never scripturally represented as eternal in Dr. Parker's sense. We read of "this age," and in contrast with it of "the age to come," to be

Digitized by Google

followed by "the ages of ages:" "Age," *æon*, being the proper rendering of the Greek substantive αἰὼν and age-abiding, *æonial*, that of the adjective αἰώνιος. The Bible representation of man's future existence, is therefore that of an indefinite succession of ages. To use the familiar mode of speech, till we get a better, we may perhaps be allowed to say that, our eternity must be everlasting time.

There is, so far as we are aware, only one passage in the whole Bible which even seems, *prima facie*, to teach that time shall ever come to an end. That passage is Rev. x. 6, which, as we have seen, is actually quoted by Canon Farrar as a proof-text. The correct reading of this verse, however, is not "that there should be *time* no longer," but, as Alford translates, "that there shall be *delay* no longer." This is placed beyond all doubt by the language of the seventh verse: "in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, *when he shall begin to sound*, the mystery of God shall be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets." For surely, adopting what interpretation of the Apocalypse we please, it is plain that time does not end at the sounding of the seventh trumpet. The sounding of the seventh trumpet in chapter xi. most assuredly precedes the Millennium, the thousand years' reign of chapter xx.; which period of time—the "good time coming"—*comes to an end* (ver. iii. 5), and is even succeeded by another period of time—the "little season" during which Satan is again to be loosed (ver. 3).

In fine, then, we are compelled to regard Dr. Parker's flat assertion that "Arithmetic is profanely out of place along the whole line of this inquiry," as a mere rhetorical flourish, which has no solid ground either in philosophy or Scripture to rest upon. Mr. Cox draws attention to the "singular and significant fact" that in all the passages in the New Testament in which the words "eternal" and "everlasting" occur, in reference to human destiny, "they are used to translate one Greek word αἰών, and its derivative αἰώνιος,—words which . . . so far from denoting either that which is above time, or that which will outlast time, are saturated through and through with the thought and element of time."*

Another high authority—Professor Plumptre—has also said, very recently, of the word "eternal" (αἰώνιος): "It cannot possibly exclude, as Mr. Maurice was led to think (*Theological Essays*, p. 436), the idea of duration, and connote only a state of being transcending that which is measured by the motion of the heavens, for the idea of duration is of the very essence of the noun, and men do not commonly use adjectives to deny that which is implied in the substantive from which they are derived. It cannot necessarily involve the thought of endless duration, for it is used of things that were essentially temporary in their nature—of the possession of Canaan by the seed of Abraham (Gen. xvii. 8), of the covenant

* *Salvator Mundi*, p. 100.

Digitized by Google

which gave the throne of Israel to the house of David (2 Chron. xiii. 5). It cannot necessarily import a merely finite duration, for it is used also of the unchangeable attributes of God. (1 Tim. vi. 16.) If we cannot hope that the word '*Æonian*' will be naturalised in our English speech as its only true representative, we must yet remember as we use it, that it carries with it, as a word, the sense of undefined, and not of infinite, duration, and that there is nothing self-contradictory in language like that of Gregory of Nyssa, when he expresses the hope that 'after an eternal interval' (*μετὰ αἰώνιον τι διάστημα*) the discords of earth may be harmonised in a divine concord.' (*De Anima.* Opp. ii. p. 689.)"*

We have done. Dr. Parker sums up his theory on the subject of Man's Immortality in these six propositions:

"First: That in the purpose and counsel of God man was created immortal.

"Second: That the immortality with which man was endowed was distinctly and solemnly conditioned by the words, 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.' Thus it was immortality *nisi*.

"Third: That, in rejecting the Gospel, man does not merely decline a privilege—which every man ought surely to be at liberty to do—he resists, inverts, and destroys a divine purpose.

"Fourth: That the destruction of a divine purpose fully accounts for and justifies the appalling terms in which the judgment of the wicked is described.

"Fifth: That, in interpreting those terms, such as 'everlasting,' 'eternal,' and 'for ever,' *arithmetic* is profanely out of place.

"Sixth: That 'life in Christ' is not an *exclusive*, but an *inclusive* expression; that is to say, it embraces all the manifestations of Christ under what name soever known, which God has granted from age to age to all the nations of the earth."

Now, if, while accepting the *first* and *third* of these propositions: which we do with our own explanations: we have succeeded in showing the untenable character of the *second* and *fifth*; then, as it seems to us, so little will be left of this theory that to gather up the fragment which remains is hardly worth the labour. As a whole the theory will, we feel confident, generally be pronounced *unsatisfactory*. We respectfully ask Dr. Parker to re-consider it; and should these few remarks aid him in the smallest degree in the work of re-construction, it will afford us much gratification to think that we have in some measure repaid the mental stimulus which we have received from his lectures.

WILLIAM MAUDE.

7, Moray Road, Tollington Park,
Upper Holloway. N.

---

* *Contemporary Review*, May, 1878, p. 344.

Digitized by Google

## HARVEST HYMN.

ONCE more, O God, thy bounteous hand
With golden plenty crowns the land,
Accept our fervent praise.
The promised weeks of harvest given,
To thee, the Lord of earth and heaven,
Our thanks we gladly raise.

Thy providence for us has done,
By fertilising shower and sun,
A deed of love divine.
At thy great table we are fed,
O, give us, too, the living bread
To make us wholly thine.

And thus, in nature and in grace,
Our Father's royal gifts we trace,
And sing our psalm of joy
To him from whom all good descends,
Whose lovingkindness never ends,
Whose love has no alloy.

W. L.

---

## "THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY COME TO PASS."

REVELATION i. 1.

No. VII.

*(Continued from July.)*

SINCE writing one of our latest pages, wherein we anticipate the formation of an international league, the aim of which will be to subvert all existing governments and dynasties that oppose it, with the professed object of instituting that universal brotherhood of nations which shall put an end to war; that power, already widely spread in Europe, has, by one of its agents, smitten well nigh to death the Emperor of Germany, and while we write it seems uncertain if he will recover from the stroke of the assassin. This circumstance has stricken with awe not Germany alone, but other nations in such degree as to divert the attention somewhat from the Congress assembling at Berlin, with its momentous issue of peace or war, as if a graver peril having graver issues might be at hand, which no Congress could ever settle. From the special correspondent at Berlin of one of our leading daily papers we quote these ominous words, written the same week as the Emperor's attempted assassination: "The spreading of social democracy's destructive doctrines, and the growth throughout the lower classes, in Prussia

Digitized by Google

especially, of a mental condition which may be described as the recklessness born of desperation, have inspired in the breasts of German statesmen and business men, landowners, financiers,—in fact, of thinking patriots and well-to-do people of all classes, apprehensions of the most painful nature as to what may be the internal convulsions reserved for New Germany in a by no means remote future. These apprehensions have been stimulated by recent and most deplorable events into a genuine panic. The terrible monster whose voice has made itself heard in menacing growls throughout the length and breadth of Germany almost continuously ever since the meeting of the three Emperors at Berlin—which was interpreted to the working classes by their oracles as the outward and visible sign of an imperial conspiracy against oppressed nationalities and popular liberties, has now shown its claws and teeth, and with such appalling effect that every man of rank and fortune, every personage born in the purple, or occupying a position of distinction, is for the moment stricken with consternation, and, shuddering at the horror of what has happened, asks himself, What will happen next?"

Speaking of the assassin, the article goes on to say: "The man was a typical specimen of the flower of social democracy, of an organisation counting millions of adherents, and thousands of acolytes, as intelligent, instructed, and fatally resolved as himself, which regards regicide and the despoiling of the rich as the highest of human duties, and which succeeds in imposing upon its disciples an obedience as absolute and a self-devotion as utter as does the papacy itself. When such a man shoots his emperor, and then himself, on purely social democratic principles, we catch an awful glimpse of the abyss of crime, misery, and horror into which society may find itself hurled at any moment, at the bidding of the occult and mysterious hierarchy that disposes of the forces exemplified by this calmly murderous and conscientiously merciless Doctor of Philosophy." A few days later, we read in the same journal, and from the same pen, the following: "German Social Democracy is incorporated destructiveness, not merely theoretical, but grimly, fatally practical. It is a grisly monster with sharp claws, trenchant teeth, and a furious temper knowing no pity, forlorn of pity for anything beautiful, lofty, or spiritual, moved by one engrossing, devouring passion, impenetrable to reason, persuasion, imprecation. There is only one way of dealing with such an incarnate demon, and that way Prince Bismarck is about to try. Time will show whether even his genius and iron will prove mighty enough to subdue the Great Dragon of the nineteenth century.

Again we quote from one of our newest monthlies, called *The Nineteenth Century*, for the present month, the following passage which closes one of its articles, entitled, "*The Social Cause of Nihilism and Pessimism in Germany.*"

"Finally, we may say that the present state of Europe in general

Digitized by Google

carries with it a pessimistic tendency; for dark clouds are overhead, spreading twilight over the earth, the light that favours pessimism. They are clouds which threaten terrible storms,—change in religions, change in social institutions, change in nations all over the earth. One feels as though war, terrible war, must come sooner or later—war that will change the whole aspect of the earth, so that should one sleep a hundred years and then awake, he would not recognise the earth as his own, so altered will be its face. And as before a storm, when heavy clouds hide the sun, the cattle hide their heads, and men fly to their gloomy dwellings, and a dim, frightened feeling creeps over their hearts beating with fear, so do nations now feel a strange voidness in their hearts, an indistinct fear, which is itself a form of Pessimism."

Ominous words these to be found in secular mediums, spread broadcast over the land in the form of newspapers and periodicals, strongly indicative to *us* that the things we are contemplating as those which must shortly come to pass, are nigh at hand, even at the doors. One might easily imagine the writer of the second article from which we quote, to have borrowed his imagery from Daniel vii. 19 and its sequel.

Before however passing on to the consideration of that august scene, *the judgment seat of Christ*, let us pause awhile to follow in thought the Church where we left her—raised, changed, and caught away to meet the Lord in the air, and—so well as we are able—contemplate her bliss during the interval we have been considering as the reign of the beast upon the earth.

What mighty contrasts have we here! Man at his worst estate in the earthlies; Man at his best estate in the heavenlies. Satan's man enthroned and worshipped by the worst of man on earth; God's Man enthroned and worshipped by the best of man in heaven. The one *for a moment*, the other *for ever*.

So well as we are able, then—for how far short must our highest conceptions be of that glory which seers in vision found it hard to describe!—let us contemplate the first meeting in person of the Bridegroom with his Bride. We think the first sight the Church matured and meetened for marriage shall obtain of her Lord, will in some sort agree with the last sight she had of him in her infancy, when "lifting up his hands he blessed them, and while he blessed them he was parted from them, and a cloud received him out of their sight." For now, as their great Melchizedek, he shall meet them fresh from the battle-field, as the true seed of their father Abraham returning from the slaughter of kings, having fought a good fight, and kept the faith to the end; now as slain ones, yet more than conquerors, they have as his true followers ascended up on high, leading captivity captive, he, their great Forerunner, comes forth with uplifted hands to bless, and with the bread of satisfaction and the wine of joy in hand, blesses them, pronouncing them "blessed of the Most High God, possessor

Digitized by Google

of heaven and earth," and as heirs of that God and joint heirs with himself in his Father's possession—now become his own and their inheritance—invites them to bless the Most High God who hath delivered them thus from all their enemies and given them a final victory. Thus as king of righteousness and king of peace he shall invite them to share dominion with him, and as Priest of the Most High God "he shall come down from offering the sin-offering, the burnt-offering, and the peace-offering,"—all in his own person fulfilled,—and forth from the right hand of the Majesty on high "shall come out and bless the people and the glory of Jehovah shall appear." (Lev. ix. 22, 23.)

Nor must we forget the many risen saints who then must bear him company, who for eighteen hundred years and more, have been in glory with their risen Lord. What their *number* may have been or *who*, we are not told, but Matthew says, "*Many* bodies of the saints which slept arose and came out of their graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many." Now, that which alone is certain of them is, that their burial-place was at Jerusalem, that the earthquake disturbed their resting-place and consequently *them*, and that when by the Spirit of Holiness the Father raised Jesus from the dead, it pleased him to raise these also, and by their appearing to many in Jerusalem, "the holy city," to give our faith assurance that not our Lord alone, but all his saints should with him share in risen life. If we might indulge our fancy ever so little, it would be to imagine that Zecharias and Elizabeth, Simeon and Anna, and possibly John the Baptist, forerunner of our Lord, were among this favoured company, who, we doubt not, tarried only the "forty days," and then as our blessed Lord's escort ascended with him, comprising together with him the the wave sheaf (Lev. xxiii. 10, 11), sample, earnest, and firstfruits of the great harvest of risen ones, which at the period we are considering shall have been at length reaped to share the glory with them. "And so shall we ever be with the Lord," said the apostle; and well may he add, "Wherefore comfort one another with these words." But how shall we conceive what is contained in those words, "*with the Lord!*" At length to see with adoring love and admiring gaze, "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who only hath (inherent) immortality, dwelling in the light which no (mortal) man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, nor can see;" but then ourselves made like him, "for we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ who shall change our vile body," to which John adds, "it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." Shall we indeed recognise ourselves when rid from the body of our humiliation *without*, and our propensity *within* to sin? Yes, verily, for then we shall only be what now we want to be, and so much more than now we are able to ask or think, for all that he is able to do he will

Digitized by Google

then have done, not only *for* us, but *in* us. The purchased possession at length redeemed with a full redemption. And when our eyes shall have been filled with his beauty, and our tongues with his praise, and again and again, and yet again we shall have united in one grand chorus, "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever," and when we shall have realised in our own very persons the *summum bonum* of all our toilsome years of earnest longings and expectations, we shall then begin to look around us, and make our first attempt to realise and recognise the company that we are in. Then at length shall we see as never hitherto have been seen,

"Apostles, prophets, martyrs there,
Around our Saviour stand."

For there shall stand Enoch, the seventh from Adam; and there Noah, the preacher of righteousness; and there Abraham, the father of the faithful; and there Joseph, whose feet they hurt with fetters; and there Moses, faithful in all his house; and there Samuel, the first of the prophets; and there David, the sweet psalmist of Israel; and there Elijah and his faithful servant Elisha, no longer calling him master or father, but fellow partaker with him in the glory; and there Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, and Zechariah, *minor* prophets no more. Nor less shall we note the new Testament worthies then and there; prominent among whom must stand Paul, no longer Saul of Tarsus, or Paul the aged and infirm; but Paul the apostle to the Gentiles, able to say of the Thessalonians and others, "What is my hope or joy or crown of rejoicing? are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming? for ye are my glory and joy." James, Cephas, and John, too, who seemed to be pillars in the infant Church, now about to be appointed "pillars in the temple of God, to go no more out." Nor shall we fail to note the Mary whom all people have since called "blessed," and the relation wherein she will stand to the Lamb in the midst of the throne—not enthroned with him, as the Romanists vainly teach—but in company doubtless with the other Maries, three of whom were found at the cross, Mary the mother of Jesus, Mary the wife of Cleophas, Salome also, our Lord's aunt; Mary, the sister of Lazarus, and another Mary possibly, "who bestowed on the apostles much labour." Without doubt all these found with him in his humiliation, shall be found with him in his glory, no longer in any sense the weaker sex, or inferior on that account, but all according to their measure of the *divine* within them full to overflowing. With what delight, too, shall we see Augustine, Cyprian, and the venerable Bede, Wycliffe, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, Luther, Calvin, and Zwingle, Cranmer, Hooper, Latimer, and Ridley, John Knox, Samuel Rutherford, and Robert McCheyne, Fenelon and Madame Guion, Newton and Cowper, Whitfield and Wesley, Thomas Chal-



Digitized by Google

mers and Edward Irving, together with not a few loved and honoured names of our own time. Oh, how one's heart leaps for joy and hope of seeing all that has been truly good and great and noble in our race gathered in one glad company around the Man whom all have delighted to honour! Nor shall these worthies with whom we have become familiar on the page of history or with whom we may have had some personal acquaintance *alone* be there, but many a servant faithful in all his house, yet never perhaps known beyond it, that his or her name should be inscribed on any page or portal, but whose work done to the Master's eye shall not be forgotten of him or lose its due reward. Many a missionary on home and foreign service, whose work has never appeared in any annual report. Many a pastor whose "cause" has been esteemed little by his fellow men, but cared for as his Master's cause shall not fail to be found there. Many a Sunday-school teacher, city missionary, Bible woman, colporteur, and mother at home, faithful to their little trust, shall be approved; while popular preachers, platform orators, and self-sufficient pastors and deacons shall be found *wanting*. For not the work so much as the spirit in which the work has been done shall be acknowledged in that day. What re-unions and recognitions of long forgotten friendships and relationships will then take place! Pastors their flocks, for whom and with whom they long had laboured. Parents their children, for whom and with whom they long had prayed, but died without an answer. Some their ancestors of the past and posterity of the future for many generations, for then shall be seen as never hitherto, how "he has kept his mercy for *the thousandth* generation of them that love him and keep his commandments." (Exodus xx. 6, see Alford.)

Then shall Christ present the church to himself, or, as Alford has it, "that he might himself present to himself the Church glorious, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but holy and without blemish," for such "hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death to present them holy and unblamable and unreprovable in his sight," and that "to the end he might stablish their hearts unblamable in holiness before God even our Father at his coming with all his saints." For then shall he say to his Father, "Behold me and the children thou hast given me for signs and wonders in their day;" and *so* before his Father and the holy angels shall he confess those who have confessed him. And now he stands as their heavenly bridegroom, claiming them for his bride as those who loved not their lives unto the death, but always bearing about in their bodies his dying, that his life might become manifested through them while yet tabernacled in mortal flesh. Now it is that we see completed the sealed number that comprise the followers of the Lamb, called in Rev. xiv., "an hundred and forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads,"—a symbolic number used three times in this book, signifying perfection; but including all the subjects of the first resurrection and

Digitized by Google

rapture, and the overcomers of the beast, his image, and the number of his name caught up in a second rapture before described. See their standing, character, and occupation, Rev. xiv. 1-5.

But now we must proceed to consider the most solemn and difficult portion of the task before us. Solemn because practical and heart-searching; difficult because so little regarded, if not altogether ignored and opposed, by the vast majority of Bible readers; and yet a great fact, as clearly revealed as any other in the oracles of truth, viz., The Judgment Seat of Christ.

Hackney. N. STARKEY.

(*To be continued.*)

---

## MR. MAUDE ON THE "RESURRECTION."

(*Concluded.*)

### ARTICLE IV.—BIBLICAL.

III. WE thus come to the passage which, for our purpose, is perhaps the most important of all; which at least takes us further than any we have yet considered. We refer, of course, to 2 Cor. iv. 16—v. 5; which is now submitted in the form prepared for the second edition of the writer's translation of the New Testament.

"16 Wherefore we are not faint-hearted; but even though our outward man is corrupting, nevertheless our inward is renewing day by day. 17 For the momentary lightness of our tribulation, in a manner yet more and more excelling, is working out for us an age-abiding weight of glory; 18 so long as we are not looking out for the visible things, but the invisible; for the visible things [are] but for a season, whereas the invisible [are] age-abiding. V. For we know that, if perchance our earthly tent-dwelling should come down,* we have a building of God, a dwelling not made by hand, age-abiding, in the heavens. 2 And verily, herein † we sigh, earnestly desiring to clothe ourselves over with our habitation which [is] of ‡ heaven—3 although even clothing ourselves § we shall not be found naked. 4 And verily, we who are in the tent do sigh, being weighed down; while yet we are not wishing to unclothe ourselves, but to clothe ourselves over, that what is mortal may be swallowed up by life. 5 But he who wrought us out for this very thing [is] God, who also gave to us the earnest of the Spirit."

*First*, I am constrained to acquiesce with Mr. Maude in finding a continued reference, throughout this paragraph, to the human body; to the entire exclusion of the very singular interpretation of some, that by the "tent" is signified this present earth or kosmos, and by the "building"

---

* Literally, "should be loosed down."

† That is, either "in this respect;" or, "in this [tent]."

‡ *Ek*, as twice in 1 Cor. xv. 47.

§ Or, "if we do but clothe ourselves"—"do but put [it] on;" the prefix for "over" being here dropped, though present in verses 2 and 4. Note also that the word in both forms is middle, not passive.



Digitized by Google

the earth or kosmos to come:—to the entire exclusion of this on the ground of (1) the correspondences between this passage and the conclusion of 1 Cor. xv., as already pointed out; (2) the continuity and unity of this paragraph itself, from the "corrupting outward man" of the commencement to the "swallowing up of what is mortal" at the close; and (3) the inherent incongruity (to use a mild word) of representing a human being as putting a world about him as a garment.

*Secondly*, on this common ground, I frankly meet Mr. Maude with three concise propositions which will reveal at a glance the extent to which, as it seems to me, this great Pauline passage sustains his theory of the Resurrection of the Dead. I beg to submit, then, that these verses sustain the following conclusions:—(1) that the believer's resurrection body has a present rudimentary existence; (2) that it has this existence in the heavens; and (3) that it is to be assumed, not at death, but at the coming of the Lord. To the first Mr. Maude has most emphatically committed himself; it is, in fact, the primary assertion of his theory; and to him belongs the merit of bringing it prominently before the readers of the RAINBOW. To the second, Mr. Maude would of course give his assent; but with qualifications which probably cannot be accepted, and which certainly need to be more clearly explained. To the third, Mr. Maude has offered an opposition which I for one must earnestly entreat him to withdraw.

*Thirdly*, a few words in support or explanation of the above propositions will now perhaps be in place.

(1) *That the believer's resurrection body has a present, rudimentary existence.* That it has *a present existence*, chap. v. ver. 1, appears most conclusively to show. I entirely concur with the reason offered by Mr. Maude for holding to the primary and most usual force of the present tense in the verb "have." Alone, the tense would have appeared to me to be far from conclusive, inasmuch as the prospective use of the present tense is not at all infrequent, and it would not have been in any way forced, in some connections, to render ἐχομεν "we are to have." But following the conditional mood "should come down," it is otherwise. It is a clear case of a usage common in the present day: "Should this fail you, well, you know, you have that to fall back on." This, at least, seems the fair and natural force of the expression. I am not sure, however, that, alone, even this would have convinced me. But when taken in conjunction with the words that follow (of which more anon) "in the heavens," then the force of an actual present is, to my apprehension, set beyond all reasonable doubt. For the combination, "we have" it—"*in the heavens*," seems framed on purpose to exclude the hypothesis that we have it only *in the intention of God*. Why say we have it anywhere in particular? Further: that the present existence of the resurrection body is "rudimentary" *only* would surely appear from this, that it cannot well be anything else until it is put on. We have not yet clothed ourselves with our heavenly habitations: *that* is what we are "earnestly desiring" to do. And this leads to the remark that we ought not to abuse the figures of speech by which the heavenly body is represented as a "building" and as a "garment." For a building or garment to be ready, the former must be reared and the latter fashioned. But the building *we* long for is not made by hand, nor is the garment

Digitized by Google

woven with tedious pains. Unlike its symbols, the *body itself* of which we speak, however rudimentary and inchoate its present existence, can be quite ready and inhabited "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." From which we may well conclude that our exposition, while moving firmly on, can afford to make haste slowly.

(2) *That the present rudimentary resurrection body exists "in the heavens."* Just here Mr. Maude's exposition would seem to halt. It explains these words as merely indicative of *kind*, as showing *what* the body is; whereas they are properly descriptive of *place*, and point out *where* the body is. "That is," says Mr. Maude, "not partaking of the grosser matter or belonging to the order of the present visible kosmos: in other words, it is a body of an etherial refinement and tenuity," &c. (RAINBOW, 1877, p. 871.) This is the less to be admitted as the meaning of the phrase, "in the heavens" that it *is* the sense—or very nearly the sense—of the quite different expression in the next verse, "of heaven." Moreover, it is not as though Mr. Maude refrained altogether from assigning "place" to the present incipient resurrection body. He calls it an "inner" body, which is to be "eliminated at death from its material envelopment." (p. 871.) I believe there is not the slightest evidence to show that it is an inner body at all. No doubt Mr. Maude appeals to the "inward man" of iv. 16 as furnishing a valid reason for calling the incipient heavenly body an "inner" one. But the question arises whether the "inward man" is a body at all? In truth, such an application of the words appears to be decidedly far-fetched. It would scarcely occur to an ordinary reader. The soul carries the personality, and is therefore, with the spirit that inspires it, emphatically the inward man. If the "outward man" is the "tent," the "garment," then certainly nothing could seem to be more obvious than that the "inward man" is the *dweller* in the "tent," the *wearer* of the "garment." This "inward man," is day by day "renewing:"—that is, either *getting renewed itself* (a perfectly admissible meaning, as appears from Rom. xii. 2); or, *renewing for itself* a new and abiding outer man (which is perhaps to be preferred as more exactly in keeping with the peculiar scope of this passage). What this inward man is prospectively in want of is another outer man, in other words a true and proper body to take the place of that which is even now corrupting. We repeat, therefore, that this verse affords no warrant for calling the rudimentary heavenly body an inner body. Consequently, its present locality is left to be determined by the verse that speaks to that point, namely, v. 1, which expressly describes it as now "in the heavens." The new building is not inside the old tent; the new festal robe is not inside the old work-day garment: in fact, if there be any such relation between them, the new is the more outward of the two, inasmuch as, instead of needing to be "eliminated" from the old as from a "material envelopment," it rather comes from without and from above, and (in the case of the saints living when the Lord arrives) is itself the envelopment which triumphantly seizes and encloses "what is mortal" and swallows it up for ever. To advance another step: as our heavenly body is not an "inner" body before death, so neither is it especially "spiritual" before the resurrection. It will, in very truth, be more spiritual after the resurrection than before, simply because it will be more complete. Nay! it will be by

Digitized by Google

the very act of rising that the spirit will take possession of its heavenly organism, and fill it with its own victorious life. But we are anticipating our third proposition. Before we advance to that let us recur to the example of our blessed Lord. Now while we know nothing whatever of his being clothed with a spiritual body between his death and his resurrection, we do know that he arose in a spiritual body—that he continued in his spiritual body uninterruptedly until his ascension—that he is in his spiritual body now, and will remain so for ever; just because we know that he is now, as the last Adam, essentially a life-giving spirit. The question then is this: when our Lord made himself visible and tangible to his disciples, when he ate and drank with them, and showed them his hands and his side, was this not as much a triumph of his spirit, earthward, as his ascension itself was a triumph of his spirit, heavenward? Hence we must utterly decline Mr. Maude's use of the word "spiritual" in this connection, to denote an attenuated or partial or wholly postponed materialisation. We may now to advantage affirm from this passage—

(8) *That the believer's heavenly body is to be assumed, not at death, but at the coming of the Lord.* We respectfully submit that this ought to be beyond question. It has already been sufficiently insisted upon that the reverse of the proposition just stated, makes the day of death to be essentially the day of resurrection. Let the testimony of this passage now be considered. (*a*) It is obvious to seize on the fact that the time when the believer will clothe himself with his heavenly robe is already determined by the comparison of the two epistles: the clothing is to take place at the supreme moment when the trumpet sounds. Settled in the first epistle, it is settled also for the second: there has been nothing to unsettle it. Two such times of clothing are, in the actual case, simply inconceivable. (*b*) But it is equally obvious to remark that the time of the Lord's coming so completely dominates this whole passage as that transformation in preference to resurrection is its key-note: only by transformation is the *un*clothing avoided; only by transformation is *over*-clothing attained, in the sense of putting one garment over another already on; only by transformation can "what is mortal" be "swallowed up by life." These considerations—unless they can be countervailed—must we think be held as conclusive.

Nevertheless, it is due to Mr. Maude to say that by his rendering of ver. 3, he has succeeded in offering an argument which appears to make for his view of the intermediate condition of the resurrection body. His translation stands thus: "Seeing that we shall in truth be found clothed, not utterly naked." The important part played by the word "utterly" in this rendering will be noticed. It implies that, with the clothing on of which this verse speaks, we *may* and *shall* be found *partially* naked; and hence it further implies that the clothing itself, however certain, will be incomplete, since he who is fully clothed is not naked at all. And thus Mr. Maude gets his argument: partial nakedness means incomplete clothing—incomplete clothing, with our heavenly bodies on, means that those bodies will be attenuated, etherial, not yet materialised—such etherial bodies, infers Mr. Maude, shall believers wear in the intermediate state between death and the resurrection. We fear it must seem presumption to think of over-setting this argument at a stroke. Be that as

Digitized by Google

it may, we have no choice but to affirm that the term "utterly" has no foundation whatever to rest upon. The Greek word γυμνός means simply "naked:" neither more nor less. There is indeed a colloquial usage, by virtue of which γυμνός may be applied to one who like Peter in his boat (John xxi. 7) is imperfectly clothed: but as this usage, with the apostle's negative prefixed, would yield the rendering, "not imperfectly clothed," or "not partially naked," and would conduct to the alternative that we must be either wholly naked or completely clothed, and so would flatly contradict Mr. Maude's argument from this verse, we cannot expect this homely qualification of the word in question to find much favour in our dear friend's eyes. If for a moment we seem to be smiling at Mr. Maude's expense, we must hasten to make amends by giving him the assurance that to him we owe the stern compulsion experienced to try and grapple with the difficulties hedging in this little verse. The difficulties are serious, and are twofold;—1st, to avoid attributing an insipid truism to the apostle; for who needs to be told that if we are found clothed we shall not be found naked? 2nd, to bring the verse as a whole into some suitable connection with what goes before it; for how, in any case, can you convert the verse into a *reason* for what the apostle has just said? These difficulties will not seem the less formidable, when it is observed that those renderings which are not well-nigh without meaning, seem to have run the shaft of despair through the grammar of the sentence. Our own honest and prolonged toil to clear a path must be our apology for giving a somewhat confident invitation to others to follow. Two resolute steps, then, and all difficulty is gone:—1st, seize, in its proper conditioning force and with its distinctive shade of meaning (with the prefix for "over" dropped), the participle, "clothing ourselves," bringing in the και for emphasis, "even clothing ourselves" (that is, as an act falling somewhat short of the "over clothing" which we *most* desire), and the first difficulty is gone—no insipidity now: 2ndly, discard the reason-giving ει γε in favour of the concessive ει περ (preferred by Tregelles on the combined strength of Codices B D F G 17) so as to warrant the rendering "although* even clothing ourselves we shall not be found naked" (namely, in the great day when we must all be "made manifest"); and the second difficulty is struck away—no incoherence lingers *so*. It is as if the apostle had said: "The main thing, I grant, is that we be found at last in our heavenly vesture"—ver. 3; "nevertheless, we would fain be spared the disrobing altogether"—vers. 2 and 4. Thus, then, deeming ourselves free to affirm that throughout this entire passage there is not one word to show that any believer will clothe himself with his heavenly body until all do so,

* It would seem, according to Hermann, that the combination ει περ when used in immediate connection with a conditional mood, conveys the meaning of our English word "provided;" but as it is not here so found, but is accompanied by an indicative, I have felt quite free to render it as in the text. Each of these particles (ει and περ) may be rendered "though:" together they emphasise a concession—"*although*, indeed, I grant you." If we accept this account of the matter, then we may say:—(1) The verse as a whole is a concession; (2) The participle ἐνδυσάμενοι conditions the concession—"although," "clothing ourselves;" (3) The και emphasises the condition—"although, even clothing ourselves"="although, if we do but clothe ourselves." We thus avoid the desperate expedient of ignoring the argumentative force of the participial construction.

Digitized by Google

"in a moment, in a twinkling of an eye," when our Lord shall come; and that till then the body of the spirit, alike for all Christ's members, is and must be "veiled" and "in abeyance;" we are bold to renew the expression of our hope that Mr. Maude will forego so much of his Theory as makes the enrobing take place at death. Enough that is unassailable will still remain to lay his brethren under most weighty obligations to him for what he has done. And this reminds us that he has yet an unsatisfied claim upon us, based on this great Pauline paragraph. For—

*Fourthly*, We have yet to ask what is the sum total of the support yielded by these verses to Mr. Maude's Theory *when needfully qualified*. (*a*) We have admitted the conclusive force of chap. v. ver. 1, as intimating the present existence of the resurrection body in a rudimentary form. (*b*) We have preferred a rendering and an exposition of chap. iv. ver. 16, which represents the inner man as being now at work renewing for itself a new outer man in lieu of that which is corrupting. (*c*) It remains to say that Mr. Maude is undoubtedly correct in regarding the next verse (17) as having direct relation to the resurrection body; as teaching that the tribulation is even now—as it passes over us, and pierces sharply into us, and heavily oppresses us, and extorts from us sighings innumerable and unutterable—working out the glory, the glory of that very body of glory, which awaits the suffering believer. This, of course, might conceivably be passing into realisation mediately, through the more circumlocutory agency of the soul—the soul's receptivity, and tenacity, and power of survival and reproduction;—but it seems like keeping more cordially in mid-stream of the apostle's present train of thought to regard the tribulation as forthwith ennobling the rudimentary body in the heavens. And we are even disposed to think that Mr. Maude might have laid an especial stress upon this verse which he appears not formally to have done. The *existence* of the heavenly body, be it remembered, is, by the hypothesis, virtually secured by and from the time of *regeneration*; and therefore, as we are here brought into contact with something that follows regeneration, even the after trial of the children of God in the school of fiery discipline, we seem to be invited to take a distinct step in advance, and to conclude that the marring lines inflicted by our present tribulation are even now being taken up amongst those ultimate material forces which the spirit is projecting into the heavens, and are being sacredly treasured there; destined to reappear hereafter as reversed lines of beauty and power and honour in the perfected materialism of our glorified resurrection bodies.

*Fifthly*, It may be worthy of a moment's remark that according to so much of Mr. Maude's Theory as we accept, it distinctly appears as though the mortal bodies of flesh and blood which the living saints are found in when the Lord comes, could scarcely be necessary to their glorified corporealism; for is not that corporealism already safe in the heavens? It is true that this is the conception to which we are led; and not indirectly either; for do not all the metaphors of this very paragraph most forcibly confirm it? The building does not need the tent; the new robe does not require the old mantle; the body of glory and life from above does not depend for being, or beauty, or vitality, or incorruptibility upon what shall be found below in the waiting saints of

Digitized by Google

the mortal and earthy and corruptible. And yet the building will swallow up the tent; the shining robe will swallow up the shabby mantle; life,—BODIES of life,—will swallow up the bodies of death. We, the living, shall be changed: this is how we shall be changed. That which is not needed shall nevertheless be appropriated. Nothing worth saving shall be lost. The last stroke that defeats death shall be delivered with the very finest skill of the victor's hand. Not even a cast-off mantle shall remain on the enemy's field. And this leads us up to a conjecture which haunts us by its romantic charm—namely, that the not-needed flesh and blood of the living saints, being appropriated, shall even be triumphantly utilised: shall *not* be merely exhaled, or in some analogous way cast off; but shall be transformed, absorbed, and brought forward in the heavenly organism, as distinguishable tints, or traits, or traces, which shall be perceptible to the cultured eye; so that it shall be evident, by a glance among the glorified, who of them had fallen asleep, and who of them remained alive and were left over until the arrival of the Lord.

* JOSEPH B. ROTHERHAM.

---

## ANGLO-SAXONS NOT ISRAELITES.

ARE we to interprot the Scriptures *literally* or "figuratively" and "spiritually?" This is a most important question, and one which few readers of the RAINBOW will find much difficulty in answering. As believers in the future actual and glorious realisation of all the promises contained in the "sure word of prophecy," we take our stand on the literal interpretation of Scripture. As believers in the glorious gift of eternal life in Christ and the solemn declaration that "the wages of sin is death;" we take our stand on the literal interpretation of Scripture. But we know that the contrary system has been and still is most generally adopted; the result being that the teaching of Holy Writ has been, to a lamentable extent, confused, perverted, and practically nullified.

That the Scriptures contain a comparatively large amount of metaphorical and allegoric language is only what might be expected in a book, or collection of books, of Eastern origin and written in Eastern style; but we believe that if we study it patiently and prayerfully, and withal exercise our common sense, we shall generally find that Scripture is its own interpreter; and though, as Matthew Henry says, "the key may not always hang beside the door," yet a careful search will hardly fail to discover it somewhere within the house.

Let us then apply this canon of literal interpretation to the word *Israel*. Once in the New Testament we find believers—Jewish and Gentile indiscriminately—spoken of by St. Paul as "the Israel of God." "As many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon *the Israel of God*." (Gal. vi. 16.) Of course the title is here used in a spiritual sense; for how else could Gentiles be regarded as Israel, seeing that they are not the lineal descendants of Jacob? Zealous spiritualisers have, however, laid hold of this metaphorical use of the

Digitized by Google

word in order to evade its obviously literal meaning elsewhere; and instead of allowing the name "Israel" to bear its primary and natural sense wherever else it occurs, viz.,—descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, they have by the utmost exegetical violence put upon it a spiritual construction.

Of course, this first step being taken, it was easy to apply the same vicious principles of interpretation in other instances. If by "Israel" believers in general—though of Gentile origin—are to be understood; then it will follow, almost as a matter of course, that by "Zion" or "Jerusalem" must be meant, not the literal "City of the Great King," but, *mirabile dictu*, the Christian Church, and so on. Nor need we be surprised to find that ultimately both the restoration of the Jews to Palestine and the personal reign of Christ on earth have been equally spiritualised away. But we do maintain that by this strange exegetical process Scripture is practically—to use Mr. Maude's somewhat alarming figure—reduced to "a solution;" being at once deprived of definite meaning and stripped of its truest grandeur. For our own part we heartily agree with that divine who, in vindicating the literal interpretation of God's revealed truth against one of the other school, exclaimed in accents of emphatic disapprobation, "So, then, you would take all the blessings of the future to yourself, and leave only the curses of the past to the poor Jews!"

Now we must express our conviction that this unnatural mode of interpreting the plain unfigurative language of Scripture has paved the way, unconsciously but very surely, for the reception of the somewhat fascinating and fashionable theory of "Our Israelitish Origin,"—the cause of the fascination being readily discovered in the fact that it manifestly ministers to national vanity and arrogance which have already reached a pitch that is suggestive of Divine judgment rather than of divine blessing. Moreover, this theory—which possesses quite a literature of its own—is, as we wish especially to point out, only the logical sequence to that spiritualising system of interpretation of which we have spoken. What wonder is it that, curiously inverting the procedure of Jacob, having appropriated the blessings of Israel, we should proceed further to deprive them of their birthright! And, joking apart, this is substantially one of the arguments most frequently made use of,—Israel was to become "a multitude of nations" (Gen. xlviii. 4); the Anglo-Saxons are a "multitude of nations," *ergo*, the Anglo-Saxons must be Israel. By parity of reasoning, however, might we not say, the Babylon of the Apocalypse was to be a great commercial city; London is a great commercial city, *ergo*, London is the Babylon of the Apocalypse. A conclusion hardly likely to prove acceptable to the same parties.

Happily it may be assumed that by most of the writers in the RAINBOW, as well as by most of its readers, "the spiritual interpretation" is repudiated. They are content to call a spade a spade. To them Israel means simply the descendants of Jacob; Jerusalem means "the city of the Great King;" the restoration of the Jews means their actual return to their own land; and the second advent means the personal coming of our blessed Lord "in like manner" as he went away.

Now, we maintain that inasmuch as the respective names, Hebrew,

Digitized by Google

Israelite, and Jew, by which the ancient people of God have been known throughout the vicissitudes of their history, belong one and all to the descendants of the patriarchs, and that therefore when we speak of a Hebrew, we mean the same as an Israelite or a Jew. So in like manner we find that generally throughout Scripture the appellation Israel is not necessarily restricted to the ten tribes, but includes the two tribes likewise; *this being especially the case when their future glory is spoken of.* It must be borne in mind, therefore, that in the eyes of the Jews every one of their members is considered an Israelite, i.e., of the lineage of Jacob, though not every Israelite is therefore a Jew—of the tribe of Judah. In the same way every Englishman is considered a Briton, though of course every Briton is not an Englishman, since he may be Scotch, Irish, or Welsh. So, again, every Prussian is a German, though every German is not a Prussian.

Hence we find that frequently in Scripture Judah and Israel are used as synonymous terms. Take for, instance, the first chapter of Isaiah. In the first verse of that chapter we have a vision "concerning *Judah and Jerusalem*" spoken of, while in verse 3 the same "nation" is addressed as "Israel," "*Israel* doth not know;" which latter term again is synonymous with "Jacob" (i.e., his seed). "Oh, house of Jacob" &c. (ii. 5); thus each appellation includes all the tribes.*

It is no doubt true that both Judah and Israel—respectively so-called after the revolt—grievously sinned against God not only as one nation, as to descent, springing from the same stock, but in their separate capacities as two distinct kingdoms, and hence we find them often singled out by the prophets, when threatenings are denounced against either or blessings promised, according as they received or rejected these messengers of Jehovah. Not so, however, when their future restoration is spoken of, in that aspect the two kingdoms are ever regarded as merged into one nation; and indeed of their future amalgamation we have a very distinct and remarkable prophecy in the 37th chapter of Ezekiel, where we read:—"Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it: For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions. Then take another stick, and write upon it: For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for *all the house of Israel* his companions: and join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand. And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not show us what thou meanest by these? say unto them: Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand" (vers. 16-19). This clear and explicit prophecy suggests three inquiries which we leave the advocates of the theory in question to answer: 1. Are the Anglo-Saxons finally to be amalgamated with the Jews—the tribe of Judah? 2. If so, how are the national position and distinctive privileges of Israel, during the Millennium, to be preserved? 3. How are all the nations of Anglo-Saxon descent to be located in the land of Palestine?

But we shall doubtless be asked, What then about the lost ten tribes?

* See also Isa. iv. 2; v. 7; and Jer. ii. 3, 4.

Digitized by Google

Where are they to be looked for? We have the two tribes in our midst, but where are the other ten? We answer, Let us go in search of them; and in order to spare ourselves a long journey into the East, we shall listen with attention to some information given us concerning them from reliable sources.

It is surely *in the East* that we are invited alike by the Word of God, the testimony of early writers, and the researches of modern travellers, to look for the ten missing tribes. Thus the Lord says, speaking by the mouth of his prophet Zechariah, of Ephraim: "I will bring them again out of the land of Egypt and gather them out of Assyria" (Zech. x. 10). See also Isaiah xi. 11, where "Elam, Pathros, and Cush" are further enumerated. Now these passages compared with 2 Kings xvii. 6, 7, certainly throw light upon each other. From the last named place we learn the locality whither the ten tribes were carried by Shalmaneser, King of Assyria; and from the former it is clear whence they will, in the providence of God, be gathered again. For so it is written: "He that scattered Israel will (also) gather him" (Jer. xxxi. 10).

But here we shall probably be met with an argument to this effect:—Do we not gather from that great authority Sharon Turner, that the ancestors of the British nation made their way hither from those very parts where Israel was in exile? To this we simply reply: Granting that this was the case, what have you proved? Why, absolutely nothing. Because, as a recent writer has well observed, "Those hordes might as well have been of Gentile as of this supposed Israelitish origin." And that the former is the correct view of the case should be obvious enough from this, had the new comers been descendants of the patriarchs, they would unquestionably have shown their "Israelitish origin," under some form or other, in the performance of certain religious rites and ceremonies. The keeping of the Sabbath and the rite of circumcision,—the latter unquestionably,—would have characterised their ritualism as forming part and parcel of their religious system, however debased they might otherwise have become by reason of their long contact with the heathen. But instead of this being the case, need we remind the reader of their idolatrous practices, of their groves and other strange customs, which presented not a vestige of an Israelitish origin; if you will but read their early history.

There is no doubt that "Central Asia is one of those parts of the world where the ten deported tribes have found a homestead." And as we are informed that the Israelites there are not acquainted with the Rabbinical traditions fostered by Judah, it follows conclusively that they must be of the ten tribes in question, and not of the two tribes, their brethren in the West.

In the interior of China also it would appear that many of the stock of Abraham may be met with; while *a considerable number*, as is believed by Jews at the present day, returned with their Judaic brethren westward at the time Cyrus proclaimed liberty to the latter. Those immigrants of the Assyrian captivity are further believed to have been the tribes of Reuben and Gad, and a comparatively small number of Levi and the half tribe of Manasseh. And what perhaps would be regarded by a Jew as a still stronger objection to the theory of "our Israelitish origin" is the circumstance that among the Russian Jews, in Lithuania,

Digitized by Google

there are yet to be found many, believed to be the descendants of Ephraim, of whom it might truly be said, "their speech bewrayeth them." since, strange to say, they are unable to pronounce "*Shibboleth*" to the present day!

Not less strange and unsatisfactory is the interpretation put upon certain passages of Scripture by these theorists. We will give just one or two as rare specimens of Biblical exegesis. It is, for example, maintained by these experts that when Christ charged his disciples not to go unto the Gentiles, but "unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel," he meant thereby that the ten tribes in all their dispersion should have the Gospel proclaimed to them, but not Judah and Benjamin or "the Jews." Now, in the first place, this is surely to deny the fulness and freeness of that Gospel which was to be preached "to every creature"—Jew and Gentile, bond and free, alike; for when Christ said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. xv. 24); he spake as the *as yet unrejected* Messiah of Israel, not as the Saviour of the world. And secondly, what in that case can be meant by the expression "*beginning at Jerusalem?*" "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke xxiv. 47.) Of whom was the population of Jerusalem mainly composed, if not of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin? Besides, the same line of argument would go to prove from the above quoted passage, that the Gentiles also were excluded!

Again, it is maintained by the same school of interpreters that by the declaration of our Lord, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt. xxi. 43); was meant, "taken from the Jews and given to Israel;" which reminds one of the common proverb, "robbing Peter to pay Paul." Surely the Divine speaker's meaning is plain enough; largely developed in the apostolic writings, and gloriously realised in the history of the Church of Christ; because the descendants of Abraham rejected the faith and hope of Abraham, in rejecting him whose coming day the patriarch saw afar off and rejoiced, God would "visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name," and thus was to be fulfilled—in a primary sense at least—the grand old promise made to their forefather: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xii. 3). If we will but understand Scripture literally and naturally, its meaning will generally be obvious enough. "I would not have you ignorant, brethren," says St. Paul, "of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, 'There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob'" (Rom. xi. 25).

At the same time this strange eagerness on the part of Gentiles to be regarded as Israelites, seems to us one among the many signs of the times, that the God of Jacob will soon favour Zion, and "will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land." Whereas the very name of "Jew" has hitherto been "a byword among the nations," even as foretold by Moses more than a thousand years before Christ (Deut. xxviii. 37); so shall it become a name of honour

Digitized by Google

in the latter days. For "one shall (then) say, I am the Lord's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." (Isa. xliv. 5.) * P. W.

---

# CANON GARBETT ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

## V.

(*Continued from page* 326.)

BUT now, what testimony have we on the other side as to what was really "the belief of the Jews in our Lord's day?" What was written within fifty years before our Lord's birth and was held in such high esteem ever since among the Jews as the semi-sacred apocryphal books were, is surely a truer exponent of Jewish opinion in our Lord's day than what was written by such a one as Josephus some fifty or sixty years after his crucifixion. Let our readers consider then the following passages from the Second book of Esdras as elucidating Jewish belief, and also as determining the sense of the same Jewish phraseology as appears afterwards in the New Testament and for which Canon Garbett and others demand a new and special *usus loquendi*.

"As the husbandman soweth much seed upon the ground, and planteth many trees, and yet the thing that is sown good in his season cometh not up, neither doth all that is planted take root: even so is it of those that are sown in this world: they shall not all be saved. . . Like as the husbandman's seed perisheth if it come not up . . *even so perisheth* man also which is formed by thy hands, and is called thine own image . . . he is likened to the husbandman's seed.* Things present are for the present, and things to come *for such as be to come*. . . Sorrows are passed, and in the end is shown the treasure of immortality. And therefore, ask thou no more questions concerning

---

* It is the same teaching of nature that influenced the mind of Mr. Tennyson, the Poet Laureate, when, speaking of Nature, he says in "In Memoriam":—

"So careful of the type she seems,
So careless of the single life;
That I, considering everywhere
Her secret meaning in her deeds,
And finding that of fifty seeds
She often brings but one to bear,
I falter where I firmly trod
. . . . .
And faintly trust the larger hope."

"The larger hope," seen to be inconsistent with the analogies of nature, being, as expressed in the preceding stanza:—

"That nothing walks with aimless feet;
That not one life shall be destroyed
Or cast as rubbish to the void
When God hath made the pile complete."

Digitized by Google

the multitude of them that *perish*. . . It was not his will that men should come to nought." (Ch. viii. vers. 41-59.) Clear as is the meaning of all this, it is made clearer still in the light of what is stated in the beginning of the same chapter: "The Most High hath made this world for many, but the world to come for few. . . . . There be many created, but few shall be saved." (Vers. 1, 3.)

In the next chapter the same idea recurs. "I have said before and now do speak, and will speak it also hereafter, that there be many more of them which perish than of them which be saved. Let the multitude perish then, which was born in vain; and let my grape be kept, and my plant; for with great labour I have made it perfect." (Chap. ix. 15, 22.) Here it is beyond all doubt (1) that the word "perish" is used in the same sense with regard to the seed of corn or young plants—as of vines —and with regard to ungodly men. Just as in the Holy Scriptures it is used in the same sense of beasts and of ungodly men. (2) That it is synonymous with "coming to nought." However great the multitude of them that perish, it is through their own fault. It is not through the will of Him that created them that they "come to nought." Just as we read in the Old Testament again and again that God "has no pleasure in the death of the wicked: but that the wicked should turn from his way and live:" and in the New Testament that "He *will* have all men to be saved," that He is "not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Now, "coming to nought" is philologically very like "annihilation," which some say we hold. But it seems that the author of the Book of Esdras held it too, and those also who read and approved of its teaching.

The same sense of "perishing" is still further borne out in the ninth chapter, where it is used of "the fruit of thy law," which "did not perish, nor could it, for it was thine: but they that received it perished, because they kept not the thing that was sown in them." So also of "the law perisheth not," while those who have received the law and do not keep it "perished by sin." (Vers. 32, 37.)

So again, we read in the book called "The Wisdom of Solomon," "Seek not death in the error of your life, and pull not down upon yourselves *destruction* (ὄλεθρον) by the work of your own hands. For God made not death: neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living (ἀπωλείᾳ ζώντων). For he created all things that they might have their being; and the generations of the world were healthful: and there is no poison of destruction (φάρμακον ολέθρον) in them, nor the kingdom of death upon the earth. For *righteousness* is *immortal*. But ungodly men, with their works and words called it (destruction) to them." (Chap. i. 12-16.) Here *immortality* is attached to righteousness and is not predicated of all mankind. It is also put in diametrical contrast to *destruction*, which is made synonymous with *death*. And the writer's meaning, clear as it is, is made clearer still in the next chapter. "For God created man"—not immortal but (επ ἀφθαρσίᾳ)—"to be immortal, and made him to be an image of His own eternity. Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world; and they that hold of his side do find it."

So farther on in the book, "For the giving heed to wisdom is the assurance of incorruption, and incorruption maketh us near to God,"

Digitized by Google

(chap. vi. 19), where incorruption (ἀφθαρσία) is the same word as is rendered immortality in the passage quoted above from chap. ii. The phraseology as well as the meaning here reminds us of what is so like it in John xvii. 3, "And this is life eternal that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Again, in the seventh chapter of Wisdom, "I myself also am a mortal man like to all . . . and I called and the spirit of wisdom came to me; . . . . for God loveth none but him that dwelleth with wisdom" (vers. 1, 7, 28): again, "Moreover by means of her I shall obtain immortality (ἀφθαρσίαν) . . . For to be allied to wisdom is immortality" (viii. 13, 17). Again, "To know Thee, O God, is perfect righteousness; yea, to know Thy power is the root of immortality." (Chap. xv. 3.) If this is not conditional immortality we know not what is. If the author of the "Wisdom of Solomon," as well as those who read him with high approval, and we venture to add those who endorsed and echoed his teaching in the New Testament,—if these were not Conditionalists, neither are we.

On the other hand, we know of only one passage in all the apocryphal books that has even the appearance of teaching eternity of life or of torment for the wicked. It is in the book of Judith (xvi. 17), where she is represented as saying "Woe to the nations that rise up against my kindred! The Lord Almighty will take vengeance on them in the day of judgment, in putting fire and worms in their flesh; and they shall feel them and weep for ever."

No one who remembers how this expression is used in the Old Testament will attach the idea of eternity of torment to "weeping for ever," or will think that it means anything more than weeping as long as ever they live. Like the leprosy of Naaman cleaving to Gehazi and his seed for ever.

As to later Jewish opinion, we would refer our readers to the Rev. E. White's Note on Rabbinical doctrine of Judgment to come (pp. 221-4 of "Life in Christ," 3rd ed.), from which we venture to transcribe the following by Dr. Alfred Dewes. Alluding to the supposed assertion of Lightfoot "that Gehenna was the abode of the damned, a place of eternal fire, and that there are endless examples to prove it" (an assertion which might perhaps be made truthfully enough if not intended, as we believe it is, to mean eternal life in the torment of eternal fire), Dr. Dewes says: "With a view to test the truth of an assertion so continuously made, the present writer has searched all the Jewish writings that can with any probability be assigned to any date within three centuries of our Saviour's birth. *And whensoever he asserts that an idea is not to be found in any work, he wishes it to be understood that the whole work has been read through, not that its index only has been searched.* It did not seem worth while to read any of the later Jewish works; it was quite out of the question to think of wading through the Talmuds; but the earlier of them is assigned to the middle of the fourth century and the later to the end of the fifth. Every passage, however, has been carefully examined even from them, which is quoted in the works of Lightfoot, Shoettgen, Buxtorf, Castell, Schindler, Glass, Bartolocius, Ugolino, and Nork: *and the result of the whole examination is this: there are but two passages which even a superficial reader could consider to be*

Digitized by Google

*corroborative of the assertion that the Jews understood Gehenna to be a place of everlasting punishment,*" i.e. "*of everlasting torment.*"

In the same Note we read:—"In the *Gemara*, which represents very ancient Jewish thoughts, the destiny of the wicked is described most fully. 'Those who sin and rebel greatly in Israel, as well as Gentile sinners, shall descend into Gehenna, and there be judged, during twelve months; at the end of which the body is consumed, the soul is burned up, and the spirit is scattered beneath the feet of the just, as it is said in Mal. iv. 3. But heretics, informers, and infidels who deny the law of God, and the resurrection of the dead, and those who cause others to sin, as Jeroboam the son of Nebat, shall descend into Gehenna and there be judged ages of ages.' The eternity of hell is expressly denied, as follows:—'Rabbi Simon Ben Lakish has said, There will be in the future no Gehenna—for the wicked shall be as stubble and the coming day shall burn them up, leaving them neither root nor branch.' . . . . The greatest of all the Rabbins, Maimonides, born A.D. 1131, at Cordova, distinctly teaches the immortality of the righteous *alone* and the absolute extermination of the wicked. His words are:—'The punishment which awaits the wicked man is that he will have no part in eternal life, but will die, and be utterly destroyed. He will not live for ever, but for his sins he will be *cut off* and *perish* like a brute. It is a death from which there is no return.'" So also teach Nachmanides, R. Bechai, and David Kimchi and others. And the learned Dr. Bentley in his Boyle Lecture, Serm. i., declares that "some of the learnedest doctors among the Jews have esteemed (extinction of being) the most dreadful of all punishments, and have assigned for the portion of the blackest criminals of the damned,—so interpreting Tophet, Abaddon, the Valley of Slaughter, and the like,—final extinction and deprivation of being."

We have gone thus largely into this subject in order to show how utterly untenable is the notion that immortality for all and eternal torment for the wicked was the received opinion among the Jews either before, at, or after the time of our Lord's life and ministry among men. For the rest, it matters little to us what opinions on the subject prevailed among them. We sit at the feet of Jesus, and of Jesus alone, in this matter especially. For he it was that "brought life and immortality to light by the Gospel." What he has taught in his own recorded words and by his Spirit in his apostles and prophets is what we accept as the faith once delivered to the saints—and it is abundantly clear to us that he taught that the righteous and they alone would live for ever; that the wicked would be punished with everlasting destruction, would perish as the beasts that perish; that eternal life and immortality are promised through him and are given in him to those who are in him; that of them alone it is true that they cannot die any more; that they shall live for ever and be holy and happy for ever.

## VI.—Conclusion.

Having now, as we believe, noticed everything that from our point of view required noticing in Canon Garbett's papers, we would bring our task to a close with a few concluding observations.

1. In the first place, we would acknowledge with a satisfaction which is by no means merely polemical in its nature, the utter absence from



Digitized by Google

Canon Garbett's pleadings for the immortality of the soul, of certain arguments from Scripture which used to be prominent on his side in this controversy. This is all the more noticeable and the more satisfactory because he had proposed to himself to prove "from Scripture and from Scripture alone" that all human souls are immortal, and also we may surely be allowed to say, because he had no superabundance of Scripture on his side and could not afford to omit reference to any passages that could in any way serve his cause.

He has never referred to Genesis i. 26 and to man being made in the image and likeness of God; nor to Gen. ii. 7, and to the Lord God having breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man so becoming a living soul.

Nor has he taken up the position occupied by Mr. James Grant when, after remarking that "annihilationists dwell in a very emphatic manner on the assumed idea that the soul is not naturally immortal," he says, "I do not feel called upon to enter into any controversy on this point; our concern is not with what might have been the state of things had Adam remained in the state of innocence in which God created him." As if man had become immortal by the fall or by being driven away from the tree of life lest he should eat and live for ever. Nor does our Canon seem to occupy the ground taken by the same Mr. Grant, when he says further on, "It concerns me little to know whether or not we inherit an unending life from our first parents: I am satisfied to know that all mankind have it now." How does he know it? "Because I read in the Word of God that 'life and immortality have been brought to light by the Gospel.' That is enough for me." That does not seem enough for Canon Garbett, nor indeed at all to the point in this matter. He never quotes that text in support of the natural immortality of all men. He knows the Word of God and teaches it somewhat better than that.

Nor has he felt at liberty with the learned Canon J. B. McCaul* to appeal to "The spirit of man" being "the candle of the Lord" (Prov. xx. 27) as a demonstration of the inherent immortality of the soul. If he ever thought of that passage or came across that argument, it probably occurred to him that the candle of the wicked might be put out by him who lit it in man.

We may fairly conclude that Canon Garbett gives up these texts of Scripture as affording him no help in teaching the immortality of the soul. Else surely he would have at least referred to them in the course of an argument on behalf of that doctrine founded on Scripture and Scripture alone. We may hope that the time of ignorance when such texts—those in Genesis especially—were quoted as decisive is well nigh past, and that we shall not hear or see them quoted in that sense much oftener. We would indeed have been not a little surprised and disappointed if Canon Garbett *had* employed them in his demonstration of the inherent immortality of the soul. Still we may say that the omission of them from his argument from Scripture for the immortality of the soul marks an era in the controversy between the upholders of

* In his "Dark Sayings of Old," Lect. ii., "The Spirit of Man the Candle of the Lord," or "The Inherent Immortality of the Soul Demonstrated."

Digitized by Google

traditional and of conditional immortality. We may thank God and take courage.

2. We would venture to appeal to Canon Garbett and those who think with him for a little thought and consideration on this subject in connection with the unevangelised heathen. It is true that he urges (p. 679) that "the adherents of the Catholic faith do not believe that all the heathen are hopelessly lost, but that they will be wisely and graciously judged 'according to what a man hath, not according to that he hath not.'* (2 Cor. viii. 12.)" No doubt he means to exclude Conditionalists from the number of "the adherents of the Catholic faith." Still he will, perhaps, be glad to know that they have quite as large a hope in this matter as he has, or as any of his school of thought, so far at least as "not believing that all the heathen are hopelessly lost." We are quite sure, too, that they, as well as all mankind, will be wisely, and if not graciously, at least righteously judged according to their works, and according to the light or the darkness they have lived in. We are not sure that it is proper to speak of grace being exercised in the judgment. We are quite satisfied that righteousness will. But there is no real difference, we feel assured, between us and Canon Garbett on that subject. We are on common ground with him when we speculate with hope and fear as to how many out of those who have heard the Gospel, and out of those who have heard it not, will be saved, and how many will not be saved. Canon Garbett believes firmly in "the finality of grace at death" (p. 708). We have never felt free to disbelieve in it. He evidently believes, and so do we, that God works in saving grace in the hearts of some of the unevangelised heathen. Neither he nor we know how far, or in how many instances, this is the case. But surely we are also agreed that the vast proportion of heathen who die in adult years die in their sins, and are not the subjects of saving grace. We believe, whether he does so or not—because an inspired Apostle has told us—that all such "having sinned without law shall also perish without law." (Rom. iii. 12.) We certainly differ as to the nature of the "perishing." We both probably feel bound to apply to all such (with whatever allowance we may feel at liberty to make for the supposed figurativeness of the language) the word of Rev. xx. 15:—"And whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the lake of fire." Whatever that lake of fire means—and surely it must mean something very awful, very terrible—Canon Garbett, we apprehend, leaves in it alive to all eternity all who are cast into it. We would ask Canon Garbett to consider whether he can call this their being "graciously judged" or even righteously judged. We ask him to bear in mind that this terrible doom was never threatened to them, that they were never warned of it—that in the vast majority of cases they were not aware that they must live for ever.† And we implore him to consider that this terrible tenet is forced

* A rather strange application of the Apostle's words when we consider that the text and context are on the subject of giving out of one's poverty or abundance to those in need. But perhaps Canon Garbett only *accommodates* the Apostle's words to his purpose; or uses them proverbially.

† Sir Patrick Colquhoun, lecturing on Buddhism on April 17, at the Royal Society of Literature, "dealt with the doctrine of Nirwâna, and came to the conclusion that it implies total annihilation of the vital principle, the soul and



Digitized by Google

on his theology, however his heart may reject it, by his belief in the unconditional immortality of all mankind, by his refusing in consequence to take the scripture words life, death, living for ever, perishing, destruction, in their natural and proper sense, by his putting a falsely theological *usus loquendi* sense upon them.

*We* can believe with St. Paul that "as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law," and believe also our Lord's words, that "he who knew not his Lord's will shall be beaten with few stripes," without believing also that such shall live for ever in what must be the the agonies of the lake of fire, or of whatever state the lake of fire may figuratively represent.

That fire, material fire, will be the means of God's judgment on impenitent sinners we are almost compelled to believe by such passages as Matt. xiii. 42, where our Lord is not speaking in parable, but is explaining his parable; and still more, perhaps, by 2 Peter iii. 7, and Jude 7, where material fire in the future and in the past is undoubtedly spoken of in connection with the future "perdition of ungodly men." And many* who hold with Canon Garbett on the subject of immortality and future punishment in general, believe that material fire is intended as the means of the torment which they hold to be eternal. We who believe that the wicked will not live for ever, and that their torment, of whatever kind, will not be eternal, can afford to believe God's word about both the fact and the mode of the perdition of ungodly men, whether they have died in their sins under the sound of the gospel or beyond it.† Is it so with those who believe without any warrant from God's word that all souls are immortal, that all mankind must and shall live for ever?

3. But there is another subject that we would urge on the thoughtful consideration of Canon Garbett and those who think with him, in connection with their unfounded belief in the immortality of the wicked. It is intimately and painfully connected with what we have just alluded to. Indeed, we would introduce it by a quotation from Canon Garbett's anniversary sermon before the Church Missionary Society, May 1st, 1876. "I refer," he says, "to the strict limits within which converting grace operates, as if for a time God checked the outflowing of His own saving love, as He checks the tides of the sea, 'hitherto shalt thou come and no further.' Who ever heard of a land, of a city, a village, a congregation, in which every soul was savingly converted to God? How rarely, even in the narrow circle of a family, can the blessed epitaph be written

---

the matter, differing in this respect from the Brahminical doctrine, which holds that the soul, after a series of transmigrations, is ultimately absorbed into the essence of the Deity, thence to be converted and redistributed as matter is. The Buddhist's hell is terrestrial, and the ultimate end of the last or perfect birth, annihilation." The Buddhists who so believe comprise "a total of five hundred millions"—nearly half the human race.—(*Record*, April 22nd ult.)

* The Rev. Flavel Cook, for instance, and the Rev. F. J. Bodfield Hooper—the former writing as if with tears; the latter, as Mr. White truly remarks, without "one word of tenderness from the beginning to the end" of his book.

† In speaking, as above, of the unevangelised heathen, we would be understood to include, as we imagine Canon Garbett would also, the unevangelised, even though the baptized, heathen of Christendom, ay, of Protestant, as well as Greek and Roman, Christendom.

Digitized by Google

over all its members, 'These all died in faith!' Whence comes it but from the self-restraint of the sovereign will of God: for conversion is His work, His work alone, into the secret depths of whose electing purposes we cannot look as yet."

We are not now constructing an *argumentum ad hominem* against the preacher of those words. They still commend themselves to the consciences of a vast number of Christians as being alike according to the facts of experience and to the truth of Scripture.

But how does the truth contained in those words of Canon Garbett about "the self-restraint of the sovereign will of God" in the exercise of His "converting grace," according to His "electing purposes"—consort with his doctrine of unconditional immortality, implying as it does an endless life in torment for the unconverted, the non-elect? This untruth to which Canon Garbett so fondly and so unwisely clings, simply makes the truth of those words of his a hateful and repulsive thing. Professor Plumptre says (in the *Contemporary Review*, May, p. 346), "We receive the thoughts of grace, election, predestination, until they land us in the *horribile decretum*." But what then? Are they then to be rejected as untrue, though seen at first to be true and scriptural? This is what is happening every day more and more in the very churches that have not only open Bibles in their hands, but have those very truths of God's word embodied conspicuously in their standards. As Dr. Petavel says, "Who preaches predestination now, either in Calvin's city or in Scotland?"

Let it be remembered that it was of the union of the doctrines—the true doctrine of predestination and the untrue doctrine, as we maintain, of the eternal sufferings of the non-elect—that Calvin used those words, "Horribile decretum, fateor." "The thoughts of grace, election, predestination" do not "land *us* in the *horribile decretum*;" and so we can not only receive them, but retain them, and let them occupy their due and proper place in our theology.

To quote the words of Professor J. W. Barlow—after his showing plainly enough that he is "no admirer of Calvinism," but stating at the same time that "the election to life is plainly taught in Scripture," —"The absolute predestination of one class of persons to eternal life, and another to eternal fire"—he means eternal life in fire—"destroys the conception of God as a moral Being. All evasion of this is hopeless. No meaningless form of words,—such as 'it *seems* to us unjust,' or 'we cannot reconcile it with our morality'—avails anything. The repugnance of the doctrine to morality stands out in the clear light of intuition. We see it as plainly as that two and two make four. . . ."

"But abolishing the dogma of eternal punishment"—*i.e.*, torment—"the paradox exists no more. No longer chained down to a tenet which destroys both the justice and the mercy of the Creator, we can bow humbly before the eternal throne, and resign the issues of life and death into the hands of him that sitteth thereon. With him is not only the *power*, but the *right* of withdrawing life at his own good pleasure. To him it belongs to decide upon which of his creatures the free and unmerited gift of immortality shall be bestowed. Sin and suffering, though finite, under his rule are difficulties no doubt, difficulties not only great but insoluble; but it is only when the attribute of infinity is presented

Digitized by Google

as an element of the suffering of the finite, that a contradiction of God's moral nature results.

"Thus the tremendous doctrine of predestination and election—a doctrine explicitly taught in Scripture—involved in every system of natural religion—denied only by shutting the eyes resolutely to the plain deliverances of reason—is at once discharged from its antagonism to morality; an antagonism which was only caused by the doctrine of eternal punishment"—*i.e.*, torment.

We remember how Canon Reichel's sermon, "Praise and Prayer," preached at the re-opening of Chester Cathedral, with its onslaught on Calvinism *cum* "everlasting torture" and its distinct suggestions of Universalism, was received about two years ago by the Evangelical party in the Church of England. We remember how it "fluttered the Volscians" in that camp, as represented by the writers in the *Record* for instance, and how the only kind of opposition made in its columns, beyond a scream of terror and of anger, was the putting together one set of texts, which taught the doctrines of grace and election as regards the saved, and another set of texts which were supposed to teach "everlasting torture" for the unsaved, leaving them in all their terrible contrariety one to another, and joint suggestion of blasphemy against God, without a word of attempt to harmonise them. We felt and saw at the time, and have long felt and seen that the truth that harmonises them is the truth of Conditional Immortality, with the wide distinction between everlasting punishment as taught in Scripture, and everlasting life in torment, as taught by Canon Garbett and those who think with him. We earnestly commend these thoughts on this important, but painful, subject to their consideration.*

---

* To illustrate what we have urged above, we venture to put side by side before our readers the following extracts from the Westminster "Confession of Faith," and "The Larger Catechism," which are standard documents of the Church of Scotland, and of other orthodox Prebyterian communions in Scotland and elsewhere.

Conf., Chap. iii. sec. vi. ". . . . Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified and saved, but the elect only."

Sec. vii. "The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by and ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice."

Chap. x. sec. iv.—after speaking of "elect infants, dying in infancy," and others, such as elect idiots, or deaf mutes—goes on to say, "Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operation of the spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore cannot be saved: much less can men not professing the Christian religion be saved in any other way whatsoever," &c.

The Larger Catechism, *Q.* 60. "*Can they who have never heard the gospel, and so know not Jesus Christ, nor believe in him, be saved by their living according to the light of nature?*

"*A.* They who, having heard the Gospel, know not Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, cannot be saved, be they ever so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, or the laws of that religion which they profess," &c.

We hope and believe that serious and utterly unscriptural as this error is—Canon Garbett did not really mean to exclude those who propounded it, and those who have held it—*i.e.*, all who hold the Westminster Confession of Faith—from the number of "the adherents of the Catholic faith," when he stated, as

Digitized by Google

And so we bring our reply to Canon Garbett's defence of "the Catholic Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul," and his attack on "the Modern Doctrine of Conditional Immortality," to a close. His defence of the one, and his attack on the other, were professedly grounded on "the positive teaching of the word of God alone." Whether or not he has succeeded in accomplishing his twofold task, we leave with confidence to the judgment of our readers. We have little doubt that those who once thought so will, for all Canon Garbett has urged to the contrary, continue to think with us that—to use the words of Dr. Olshausen—"the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the name, are alike unknown to the entire Bible." We venture to hope that if any, who once thought otherwise, have been led to read what we have written, they may have seen some reason to think with us on this important question, and on those intimately connected with it.

We have only to express our earnest hope that, in the course of debating this matter with a powerful and respected antagonist, we have not been led to write anything calculated to wound his feelings, or inconsistent with our high regard for him, as an exemplary Christian minister, and a theologian of deserved repute in the church of Christ. If any such expression has escaped our pen, we trust that he, and our common Lord and Master, will pardon it.

W. T. Hobson.

---

## THE DIVINE SENTENCE ON SIN.

(*Concluded.*)

THE Holy Scripture declares: "When a wicked man dieth his expectation shall perish; and the hope of the unjust perisheth," "But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." "The hope of the righteous shall be gladness; but the expectation of the wicked shall perish." "The way of the Lord is strength to the upright; but destruction shall be to the workers of

---

we have quoted above, that such "do not believe that all the heathen are hopelessly lost."

What the "wrath for their sin" is, which is thus denounced on all the non-elect, including all the heathen, is expressed as follows:—

Conf., Chap. xxxii. sec. 1. ". . . . the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day."

Chap. xxxiii. *Of the last Judgment.* Sec. ii. ". . . . The wicked who know not God, and obey not the Gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast into eternal torments," &c.

Catechism *Q.* 89. "*What shall be done to the wicked at the day of judgment?*

"*A.* At the day of judgment, the wicked . . . . shall be cast . . . . into hell, to be punished with unspeakable torments, both of body and soul, with the devil and his angels for ever."

The doctrine of the 17th Article of the Church of England is much more guardedly scriptural than what we have quoted above on the subject of election. But even it, when combined with eternal torment for the non-elect, is indescribably shocking. We are thankful that the Church of England no where confines salvation to the elect among those "professing the Christian religion" and "elect infants," idiots, &c.

Digitized by Google

iniquity." "The light of the righteous rejoiceth; but the lamp of the wicked shall be put out." "Destruction shall be to the workers of iniquity." "Fret not thyself because of evil, neither be thou envious at the wicked; for there shall be no reward to the evil man; the candle of the wicked shall be put out."

The wisest of men, guided by inspiration, has declared: "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." These are not the words of man, but of God, who declared, "Out of it wast thou taken, for dust thou art and unto dust shall thou return."

"Surely men of low degree are vanity, and men of high degree are a lie; to be laid in the balance," "they are altogether lighter than vanity;" "verily every man at his best estate is altogether vanity,—surely every man is vanity." But it is needless to multiply quotations. The testimony, is, of course, uniform in the Divine Book. The essence of that testimony from first to last is, "The soul that sinneth shall die."

In settling this important question there can be no authority admitted save that which is divine, and therefore infallible. "He has magnified his Word above all his name." The idea that the revelation of God's will requires human interpreters before it can be understood, is most arrogant. All that is wanted is correct translation from the original languages. The judicious Hooker has well observed, "I hold it for a most infallible rule in the exposition of sacred Scripture, that when a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst. There is nothing more dangerous and delusive than that art which changeth the meaning of words, as alchemy doth, or would do, the substance of metals, making of any thing what it listeth, and bringing in the end all truth to nothing."

Apply this rule to the passages quoted, and where shall we find the doctrine of the immortality of the soul and eternal torments? Yet, we are taught that the words used by the Holy Ghost mean the very opposite of that which they express! Hence, when God declared to Adam. "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," he did not mean that he should die, but that "he should lose the moral image of his Creator;" and that his soul should endure eternal torment, "should die a death that never dies,"—thus denying that man is mortal.

We maintain that God has expressed himself so clearly on this momentous subject that we need no commentator to enable us to understand it.

The very nature of God is opposed to sin. God is holy, he therefore cannot suffer sin to exist for ever. His holiness demands that "The soul that sinneth shall die." This punishment is eternal in its duration. The sentence is absolute, carrying with it the certainty of execution.

This sentence, "Thou shalt surely die," not only shows us how utterly odious sin is to God, but it lies at the foundation of God's government over his creatures, especially his transactions with the sinner; and, therefore, sin cannot be perpetuated or allowed to exist for ever. His

Digitized by Google

glorious character forbids. This was the basis of his dealings with Adam; and after the transgression of the divine law it was re-affirmed;—"And unto Adam he said, In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

This same righteous law also applies to him by whose fascinating power and wickedness our first parents were tempted and drawn from allegiance to God. Therefore, God pronounced the sentence of DEATH against Satan also. Satan bruised the heel of Christ, the woman's seed, while he hung upon the cross; but that was all he had the power to do. For Jesus, "having spoiled principalities and powers, made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in himself." And Jesus, the Captain of our salvation, shall yet "bruise the serpent's head;" as it is written: "Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil." Destruction is the end that awaits the devil. The most effectual and certain way to destroy a serpent is to crush his head; and here we have a figure so simple that any child can understand its force. The serpent's head is to be crushed; certainly a strange way of giving us the idea of endless preservation!

When he is destroyed, who is the author of sin, every vestige of evil shall also be destroyed. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the Devil." When the Devil, and the works of the Devil are all destroyed, will there not be an end of all sin? "The former things shall all have passed away." "The glory of the Lord shall endure for ever! the Lord shall rejoice in his works;" then shall his saints "Praise him for his mighty acts; and praise him according to his excellent greatness."

The great principle of divine government is ever the same. A holy and righteous law can only be vindicated by exacting the penalty attached to its transgression. There can be no righteousness when this is departed from, and there can be no grace when this is set aside. God's holiness must be vindicated, therefore it is declared of the impenitent, "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."

That is not grace which does not rest on this. That is not grace which tampers with law. A capital offence demands capital punishment of justice. Nothing less will satisfy the demands, because a holy law must be vindicated. The holy law of God has been fully vindicated. The word of Jehovah has gone forth, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man who is my fellow,—smite the shepherd." "He himself has borne our sins in his own body on the tree." "He was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was he stricken." "He poured out his soul unto death; and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bore the sins of many."

Our life was forfeited, and the only possible ransom was life for life; "without shedding of blood there is no remission." "For it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." "We are delivered from going down to the pit" because God our Father found the ransom (an atonement, margin, Job xxxiii. 24). Jesus was that ransom, "He has re-

Digitized by Google

deemed us from the power of the grave." He has said, "O death, I will be thy plagues! O grave, I will be thy destruction." We are therefore redeemed, not from God, but to God. "Salvation is of the Lord," wholly of the Lord. It cannot be merited or bought; it must be received as a free gift, or not at all. Therefore, Jesus has declared, as His own prerogative, "I give unto my sheep eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any one pluck them out of my hand. My Father, who gave them me, is greater than all; and no one is able to pluck them out of my Father's hands. I and my Father are one." "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; that all should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him.

"It is not thy tears of repentance or prayers,
But the blood that atones for thy soul;
On him then who shed it thou mayest at once
Thy weight of iniquities roll.
His anguish of soul on the Cross hast thou seen?
His cry of distress hast thou heard?
Then why, if the terrors of wrath he endured,
Should pardon to thee be deferred?"

It will not, it cannot be; he himself has said, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else." "For if by one offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ."

Redemption is a finished work. "We are redeemed from the power of death." He pardons freely. "By the will of God we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Christ once." Our great "high priest needs not, therefore, to stand ministering in the presence of God;" but having "offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; for by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

Man is frail, weak, subject to death and corruption, "at his best estate altogether vanity." Immortality is not inherent; eternal life is declared to be the free gift of him "Who only hath immortality—dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen or can see; to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen."

The idea of the natural immortality of man is a vain conceit, originating in the lie of Satan, and retained solely on account of that pride of man which, though highly esteemed among men, is an abomination in the sight of the Lord." It robs Christ of his glory as the giver of eternal life; and, therefore, undervalues the atonement and that precious blood through which alone we are saved from everlasting destruction.

In the language of an eminent teacher and scholar, "we would express our conviction that the idea of the immortality of the soul, has no source in the Gospel; that it comes, on the contrary, from the Platonists,—and that it was just when the coming of Christ was denied in the Church, or at least, began to be lost sight of, that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul came in to replace that of the resurrection. This was about the time of Origen. We assert that this view has taken

Digitized by Google

the place of the doctrine of the resurrection of the Church as the epoch of its joy and glory.* Where is the necessity of a resurrection unto life if the soul is immortal and cannot die? How can the gift of God be eternal life, if all men have inherent immortality? If the soul can never die, why has the Lord Jesus commanded us, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell?" If "the soul can never die," why hath God, who cannot lie, declared "The soul that sinneth it shall die?" Why are they "who walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government, presumptuous, self-willed," declared to be "as natural brute-beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, who shall utterly perish in their own corruption?"

Shall we believe the lie introduced by the devil in the garden of Eden, afterwards systematised by a heathen philosopher, and introduced into the Church, as Mr. Darby very truly declares, to undermine the very foundation of "that blessed hope," or shall we rather believe what God has declared, "The wages of sin is death;" "The gift of God is eternal life?"

We choose to believe God, and to confess his truth before men, despising the shame it may and does subject us to; for he that is ashamed of Christ, or of his words, of him will the Son of Man be ashamed before his Father and his holy angels."

We appeal to the Word of God, and to that alone, as proof of the things of which we have spoken. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." God forbid that we should "be wise above that which is written." We desire rather to cast down imaginations, or reasonings, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ," to be subject in all our thoughts to his Holy Word, to have our faith in all things, not in "the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." Having diligently and prayerfully "searched the Scriptures to see whether these things are so," we have found their united testimony to be that man is mortal, and that eternal life is the free gift of God, in Jesus Christ."

But "the fear of man which bringeth a snare" has led many to either deny, or hold these precious truths secretly for fear of the rulers.

It is a fearful thing "to be ashamed of Christ, or of his words;" for ourselves we dare not, from the fear of man, conceal a knowledge of these important truths which he, in his grace, has made known to us in his own Word of life and truth, or even by our silence seem to approve of errors which we know to be contrary to his holy mind and will. "For what if some do not believe? Shall their unbelief make the Word of God without effect? God forbid; yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, that thou mightest overcome when thou art judged." We dare not on principles of expediency, hold back a truth we have found in the Word of God, because it is obnoxious to brethren whom we love, and therefore unpopular; we dare not be ashamed to confess our convictions of any divine truth, or suffer any man, or set of

* The Hopes of the Church, by John N. Darby, 2nd Edition, p. 32.

Digitized by Google

men, to rule our conscience. No. "It is the confession of that truth, which for the time being is unpopular, which tests our fidelity to Christ." We ought as much to fear being ashamed of the words of Christ as we should be to deny his divine person in incarnation, because it is his person which gives value to his blood, or to his words. Yea, has he not placed his word above his throne? This lie of Satan not only contradicts God's express declaration, but it undervalues the precious blood of Christ, and the atonement which he has made.

If man is immortal there can be no regeneration as taught by our Lord to Nicodemus. If Adam was created immortal, where was the necessity of guarding the way to the tree of life, lest he should put forth his hand, and eat, and live for ever? It was in infinite mercy to man that God hindered him from becoming an immortal sinner.

If all men are now immortal, their immortality is not the gift of God in Christ, and there is no meaning in the declaration of our Lord. "The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." Let us not rob Christ of his glory as the author and giver of eternal life. He has declared, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life" (not merely eternal happiness, but eternal life), "and they shall never perish." To teach man that he has an immortal soul which cannot perish, fills him with pride and vain conceit, and leads him to reject the solemn truth that he is "dead in trespasses and sins;" "that he is condemned already;" "that the wrath of God abideth on him;" and thus believing that he is immortal, and cannot perish, he declares that he who made the soul cannot destroy it; and that, although "enemies of the cross of Christ," they shall not "utterly perish in their own corruption."

On no subject has God spoken more plainly than on this. He puts man in the very dust, as altogether vanity,—as lighter than vanity, "as a snail which melteth, and passeth away; like the untimely birth of a woman."

It is of the very highest moment that man should understand his true position before God,—as "condemned already," as being even now under sentence of death. "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life;" "for all the wicked will God destroy."

The pride of man will not allow him to acknowledge that his ruin is so complete. The deepest want of the unconverted, and the greatest want of even those who know that they are saved, is the abiding conviction of this truth, man's utter helplessness and entire ruin; yet to receive, and honestly confess this truth, will, in most cases, ensure loss of fellowship in Christian labour, and cause us to have our names cast out as evil. Nevertheless it is a most blessed truth; for a reception of this truth forbids faith in all human machinery, and all calculations based upon any power in ourselves. Man's regeneration of himself is but an idle dream, bearing witness to a want none but Christ can meet. "Ye must be begotten from above" is not a form of speech, but a solemn reality. The only argument we should present to sinners why they should believe in Christ is, that they are by nature and practice wholly, totally, and helplessly ruined, without any remedy in themselves, or in

Digitized by Google

anything apart from Christ. "A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit." It is a divine truth, that "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God;" and therefore all are under the curse—our nature is wholly corrupt: "that which is born of the flesh is flesh."

The acknowledgment and deep conviction of this truth is necessary to the believer. By it he is led to mark and know the workings of his old nature, and to discern the contrast between the workings of the flesh and the workings of the spirit, or new nature.

Thus he gains a victory over his mightiest foes, through dependence and prayer. In the deep and full reception of it, liberty is brought to such as are in bondage through the false teaching of those who have led them from the simplicity of faith in that redemption which is wholly of grace. It brings comfort, joy, and peace to those whose hearts are inclined to depression, leading them to a full and entire renunciation of self. Making them to know that as their salvation was a real quickening of their souls, dead in trespasses and sins, unmerited, and God's free gift, it cannot be forfeited or lost; and that, having been saved by Christ alone, his unchanging love and faithfulness is their abiding confidence and joy: and, with the Apostle, they can say, "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified unto Christ; nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." "We do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness came by the law, then is Christ dead in vain."

He has made peace for sinners, who, renouncing themselves and their own ability to do anything to save themselves from ruin and death—fly to him for life. Here alone can we get solid abiding peace and joy. If we would have that assurance which rejoices in Jesus, there must be no confidence in the flesh, we must come as those who are without strength and without hope, that we may find all our strength and hope in God. When we are brought to fully realise "The sentence of death in ourselves, we shall not trust in ourselves, but IN GOD, who raiseth the DEAD, who delivereth us from so great a death, and doth deliver, in whom we trust that he will yet deliver." The effect cannot but be a deeply practical one. Our hearts will be kept humble, trusting in him, "Who was delivered because of our offences; and was raised, because of our justification; therefore, being justified, faith appropriated this fact, and we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God."

The gospel is no gospel except to a lost and ruined race totally helpless. "We are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." It must, therefore, be quite evident that it is all of grace, free grace, sovereign grace, from first to last; "not of works, lest any man should boast."

Whatever leads us to form an incorrect estimate of the extent of our ruin as sinners (and surely the belief of man's inherent immortality is such a false estimate) takes from the greatness of the salvation which delivers out of that ruin. It does worse, it disparages and undervalues the grace that has met that ruin, and saves the lost.

Digitized by Google

If redemption is not from death and everlasting destruction, then grace is less gracious than the Scriptures represent it to be; for that word teaches us that "he hath redeemed our souls from death, and our life from destruction." If men were taught to believe, as the Scriptures teach, in their utter ruin and mortality, they could have no subterfuge to shelter them from impending wrath; their only refuge from destruction would be to fly to Christ, the giver of life.

We are exhorted to contend, yea, "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints." What is that faith? but the confession that Christ alone can meet the need of men "dead in trespasses and sins."

The Cross has stood an unchanging witness of the entire ruin of man, and of the sentence of a holy God against sin: for "it is written, cursed is every one who hangeth upon a tree." Jesus has borne that curse for us. He who "knew no sin has been made sin for us." He has died, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. Let us confess this truth, humbling to our pride though it be, and boldly and faithfully acknowledge the sovereign grace by which alone we are saved from death, and made sons of God. "Beloved, now are we sons of God."

And may that holy truth sanctify the heart and purify the life of every soul who feels its quickening power; and fill us all with a deep and more intense gratitude to him "who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath appointed us to be a kingdom of priests unto him," and who now bids us to go forth without the camp bearing his reproach;" for "here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come; by him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually; that is, the fruit of our lips confessing to his name." Adoring him who alone is the author and giver of eternal life, "who only hath immortality—to whom be glory for ever and ever, Amen." Protesting alike faithfully and constantly against the errors of universal salvation on the one hand, and the lie of the old serpent, the devil, "Ye shall not surely die," on the other.

"Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth."

A. Forbes Porter.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### EDWARD IRVING.

Dear Sir,—Permit me to express my thanks for the able contribution of Mr. N. Starkey, with "special tribute to E. Irving's mission and ministry," which I hope and expect will gratify "the thousands (of whom Dr. Chalmers speaks) who knew his worth and were awakened by his ministry," and tens of thousands since in Great Britain, Continent, America, &c.

I was stumbled and annoyed by the subsequent depreciation of the successful teaching of the recent ministers and members of the "Catholic Apostolic Church," and submit three brief objections thereto. I call *three witnesses* confirming the excellent tribute of Mr. Starkey, to

Digitized by Google

the Rev. E. Irving, restorer under God of the doctrine of the Second Advent, &c. (which Sir Isaac Newton hoped and believed would be revived in the latter days!).

But my three witnesses testify against your worthy contributor's strange inference as to the succeeding defective influence of "The Catholic Apostolic Church," and as its oldest deacon and archdeacon I ought to know something thereof.

1. Thomas Bosworth, Chief London publisher of the works of the ministers and members of the Catholic Apostolic Church, most of whom were, twenty or thirty years ago, conformists to the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregational Churches, &c. Of course, when they "became fools for Christ's sake," they suffered loss of fame as learned scholars, and other losses; . . . but however, "by their works we know them!"

2. "Dr. Bomberger; condensed theological encyclopœdia, assisted by distinguished theologians of various denominations;" Part 12, "On E. Irving and Irvingites," pages 655 to 659. "Berlin and Basle are their principal centres, Dr. Theirsch (*vide Thos. Bosworth's Lists*) is their most important convert; congregations are found, too, in East Prussia, Memel, Konigsberg, Posen, Pomerania, Silesia, Saxony, Marburg, Augsburg, &c." Mr. N. Starkey asks: "Has it (Catholic and Apostolic Church) produced men of power beyond the pale of their own Church?"

3. "Creeds of Christendom:" Editor, Professor Schaff, aided by *six or seven learned colleagues* of the Union Theological Seminary of New York. Vol. I. Pages 905 to 915.

"In 1822 E. Irving became at once the most powerful and popular preacher of London; * overflowing with bodily and spiritual life and energy. He excelled in the noblest gifts of eloquence, on the models of Bishop Hooker and Jeremy Taylor!"

With other high eulogiums, a fair and favourable epitome is given of the history and doctrines of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, and our second witness is confirmed by this third witness in special reference (p. 905) to Dr. Thiersch (*convert*) as our Tertullian!

Let beloved N. Starkey think of these things. Heaven bless him.

Yours with much esteem,

OLIVER LYNDALL.

2, Oriel Road, Homerton, E.

---

## A DISCUSSION CLASS.

DEAR SIR,—Some time ago you published an invitation from myself to young men to join me in an endeavour to form a Bible-class, where the truths taught in your Magazine could be freely discussed. I am happy to inform you that we have commenced such a class. We meet at No. 12, Red Lion Square, every Sunday afternoon at three o'clock, and if you would be kind enough to state this in next month's RAINBOW, we should esteem it a great favour. Yours sincerely,

H. MURRAN.

---

## Literature.

*The Romish Mass* and its Kindred Doctrines. By Thomas Mills. London: Elliot Stock.

THIS is an honest book. Protestant zeal does not exaggerate the errors of Popery—that indeed is hardly possible — but Protestant

* Was there no Divine Purpose in this?

Digitized by Google

fidelity describes the thing as it is, and that is quite enough. It is in vain to wish that those who are trying to bring England under the sway of the Vatican would read this book. They are too much enamoured with senseless forms to study solemn facts.

*The Bishop of Lincoln's Sermon* on Endless Torments Refuted. By Henry S. Warleigh. London: Elliot Stock.

We like to see truth vindicated by a man who knows what he is about. The Rector of Ashchurch is, of course, courteous, but he criticises the Bishop of Lincoln in a manner which his "lordship" will not relish.

*Canon Farrar's "Eternal Hope."* A Review. By Robert Paterson. Belfast. London: Elliot Stock.

Neither Canon Farrar nor Mr. Paterson has grasped the doctrine of Scripture on this question. Hold to the fiction that man has by nature an "immortal soul," and all your reasonings will end in failure.

## NOTICES.

Anglo-Israel.—Prophecy is fulfilling rapidly before our eyes, and the fact is not observed. We hold that the Anglo-Saxons are Israelites, and that they specially represent the tribe of Ephraim, to whom the birthright was given. Israel was promised an inheritance of vast extent. The promise was fulfilled the other day, as one of the first fruits of the momentous Eastern question. England is the heir, and England is now the ruling power in Asia. The inheritance promised to Abraham has come to us. Egypt with the Suez Canal and the maritime route to India, Asia Minor with Arabia, as also Syria and the rich Euphrates districts, Turkey on both sides of the Bosphorus, together with the road over Persia to the vassal States of Central Asia, are now all under the powerful dominion of Great Britain. This enormous sovereignty over India, Asia, Syria and the Holy Land could come to no people on earth but one. There is no longer any obscurity. "The time of the End" has come." *We* are Israel, and *we* possess the land of promise! Let us watch the sequel with profound and prayerful attention. Events will be speedily developed now. Our faith has not been disappointed. Our hope will be splendidly realised. Thanks to the God of Israel! And the coming of the King of Israel is not far distant now. On all this we must speak more freely hereafter. This is simply a note to call attention to the great theme.

Rainbow Tracts.—The pamphlets "Life Everlasting" and "The Ministry of Evil" are out of print. We are thankful to hear from time to time that they have comforted many hearts. We hope next month to print a large edition, in neat small book form, for gratuitous circulation. At the same time we shall issue a new pamphlet entitled "The Life the Light," uniform with the others, so that they can be enclosed in letters by those who wish to do good in this way. There are a few copies on hand of "The Rich Man and Lazarus," and "The Scripture Doctrine of a Future Life." Friends wanting any of these "Rainbow Tracts" will please apply to the Editor, 34, Sandringham Road, Kingsland, London, E.

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

SEPTEMBER, 1878.

## THE TREE OF LIFE

### CONSIDERED AS A SOLUTION OF CURRENT CONTROVERSIES REGARDING IMMORTALITY.

PART I.

NOTHING could well be more surprising, and certainly nothing could be more unsatisfactory than the way in which able and candid men will discuss Bible themes apart from Bible teaching. One would have deemed it antecedently incredible that any competent teacher could go to the Book of Genesis expressly to expound the subject of immortality and never once allude to *the tree of life* therein so significantly mentioned. And yet this feat has lately been achieved by no less competent and fearless a man than the eloquent minister of the City Temple, Dr. Joseph Parker.

This eminent preacher and writer has drawn from a fragmentary reference to the threatening of death denounced against the eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil what he considers to be a better watchword than "Conditional Immortality," and that is "Conditional Mortality." But, at the outset, it is unfortunate for Dr. Parker's proposal that it is death and not mortality that is threatened; for death and mortality are not the same thing, seeing that death may be threatened to one who is already mortal. "Conditional Death" is the only watchword to be drawn from the Divine prohibition concerning *this* tree. Perhaps a proper consideration of the companion tree would have been more successful in eliciting from its short but striking story the disfavoured motto, "Conditional Immortality."

Be that as it may, certain it is that the biblical collocation of ideas is "life *and* incorruption,"* and therefore life *and* immortality: life first, and then immortality. And this with

* So we find in 2 Tim. i. 10: ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν.



Digitized by Google

transparent fitness; inasmuch as immortality is only a predicate of life. As only that which lives can die, so only that which lives can live on, live without dying, live for ever—be immortal. Dr. Parker's structure has no adequate foundation: he has not discussed life, and therefore cannot discuss immortality. The modest "tree of life" which he has neglected will be avenged on him: let us hope that some leaf from its truth-conserving foliage may serve for the healing of his wounds.

Let us try to restore the equilibrium of inquiry by studying what is said in Genesis i. ii. concerning *the tree of life*. We shall not do wrong to observe the utmost simplicity in our exhibition of the facts of the case: we will not make mysteries; as little will we shut our eyes to any which God may have placed for us to find.

*First*, then, the tree of life was a *tree*. It grew out of the ground like another tree. The soil nourished it, the rain or dew watered it, the sun warmed it, the breezes fanned it, the birds of heaven warbled in its branches. It was only a tree. It was not a man leading before Adam's eye a moral and exemplary life; nor was it a heavenly messenger addressing a prolonged intellectual monition to Adam's ear. There was neither pattern nor fellowship for man in that tree. It was not a manifestation of obedience, or patience, or suffering, or self-sacrifice. The tree did not range with the man. The tree was no personal redeemer: it was no Christ. It was only a tree. And yet it *was* a tree; and therefore the embodiment of a divine idea, the means to a divine end. It was the expression of of some life-preserving "word proceeding from the mouth of God;" and therefore it was divinely fitted to serve its function in the paradisaic economy. Hence, although this tree of life does not take us out of the natural world; yet it may have been and must have been a wonderful tree. In truth, all trees are wonderful: chiefly those that feed or medicate God's sentient creatures. This tree was probably the most wonderful of all the trees in the garden of the Lord. It was pre-eminently—by divine title and divinely ordained function—"*the tree of life*." In a sense, all the food-trees in the garden were trees of life: they nourished and renovated and prolonged the life that God himself had given to man. This tree went beyond them all. Its power was unique. It added "immortality" to "life;" that is, it took away the tendency to die. This was its appointed function. It did not give life: God did that. It did not sustain life: the food-trees served that end. It medicated life. It healed it of its tendency to decay, to wear out, to end. To eat of that tree was to live on and on for ever. Sufficiently wonderful! It demands our faith, although it is not beyond it. By faith, however, we do understand that he who through his Son adjusted the ages and made the worlds and created man, made also this wonderful provision in paradise by means of the tree of life. In the tree of life, then, we have IMMORTALITY PROVIDED: no more, no less!

Digitized by Google

*Secondly*, the tree of life was *one tree among others*. It was a part of a whole. Its place was in the paradise of the old world: not in the paradise of God in the heavenly Jerusalem, nor in any real or supposed paradise of separate souls. Its appointed action was on man in paradise—on the life which man had then and there—on the undivided, complex life which God by creation had already bestowed. Its purpose was to immortalise the man. If its action had specific relation to any part of man, that part must surely have been his body. For the medicine of immortality was the *fruit* of a *tree* to be *eaten* with the *mouth*. There is not a syllable here about immortalising the soul, analytically considered—the soul *of* the man, the soul as a *part* of the man. The whole question is whether the synthetic "living soul" of the Book of Genesis, in other words THE LIVING MAN, the pyschic being, is to live for ever. To introduce the analysis of the great apostle Paul into this narrative, *without notice*, and to transfer the question from man to his soul,—from man *the "soul"* to MAN'S SOUL, from man as a *whole* to man in *part*, from the soul *including* the body to the soul *excluding* the body (for that is what it amounts to)—is to execute a movement which only lacks the conscious intention which we should be sorry to attribute to any one to make it a piece of exegetical jugglery. We are prepared with the greatest alacrity to pass from Moses to Paul; only, when we make the transition, we must modify our speech accordingly, and, with our great Christian philosopher and logician, attribute mortality and immortality not to the soul of man but to his body. (1 Cor. xv.)

*Thirdly*, the tree of life was a *central* tree. It stood, we are told, "in the midst of the garden." As nothing here can be accidental, we may unhesitatingly connect the place of the tree with the purpose it was to serve. The provision to immortalise man was central to the whole paradisaic economy. But—

*Fourthly*, the tree of life was a *companion* tree. It was one of two central trees. Side by side with the tree of life, equally "in the midst of the garden," stood the tree for the discerning of good and evil. Consequently the immortalising of man is not the only problem which lies at the heart of his paradisaic life. There is another question to be solved—that of developing in man the power of discerning good and evil. God himself, in centralising these two questions, associates them. Hence they must be studied together. Moreover, if what is first in design is last in execution, we need not be surprised to find that God determines to bring the second problem—of good and evil—to the front. And this leads us to observe that—

*Fifthly*, the tree of life is a *reserved* tree. It is, indeed, first named, but it is not first explained. Practically, it stands behind its companion. No description is given of it. Its fruit is not prohibited, it is true; on the contrary, permission to eat of it is included in the general grant. But that is all. No special atten-



Digitized by Google

tion is called to it in any way, and the general grant is, of course, practically conditioned by the law of *season*. A grant of the fruit of all the trees in the garden, save one, is not a command to partake of all at once. It can only mean: You may take them *as they ripen*, and take them *as you need and desire* them. No man can say that the fruit of the tree of life ripened as quickly and as fully as the fruit of the tree for discerning good and evil. If it were otherwise, still the law of *appetite* comes in. For a while, man may not have felt—in all likelihood he did not feel—any need or wish for the fruit of the tree of life. He was young. He was well. He had an abundance of food, ripe and ready, on every hand. Death to him was unknown, unfeared. He had as yet no prurient curiosity. He could wait, and gratefully take everything in its season. He was no idle boy in a forbidden orchard, plucking and spoiling what he could not eat. Moreover, we know of nothing to lead us to suppose that the Divine Father had yet explained to his children the mystery of this tree: it is quite conceivable that its name may have been announced, with a promise to explain its design at a future time, in due season. One thing we do know, namely, that special attention was fixed on its fellow; and we well understand how the directing of the eye to one thing diverts it from another, although that other (and even because that other) is close at hand. One thing more we know: when man took of the forbidden tree, he had not yet taken of the tree of life. The divine words, "And now lest he should put forth his hand, and take ALSO of the tree of life," are conclusive proof of this. Why, it reads as though the tree of life had been included in the prohibition of its companion! We know it was not so. But, if not formally prohibited, then it must have been practically reserved; for we may be sure that if God had wished his creature to partake sooner of the tree of life, he would have guided him ere this to taste of its immortalising fruit.

How profoundly significant such a reservation is surely needs not be shown. God is in no haste to make man immortal. He leaves the question of immortality in abeyance. He wishes another question settled first—the question of good and evil. Man lives: let it first be settled whether he will live loyally, before it be settled whether he shall live for ever. Is this a correct reading of the facts? If it is, then what have we here but IMMORTALITY CONDITIONED upon free and holy moral development? We know that the condition was not realised. Instead of learning to know good and evil in God's time and in God's way, man weakly and wickedly chose to learn it in Satan's way. The result was—

*Sixthly*, the tree of life *withheld and guarded*. We need not shrink from saying that in Gen. iii. 22-24, we have a most instructive and impressive manifestation of divine haste to prevent man's eating of the fruit of the tree of life. For what have we here? We have an unfinished sentence—a sentence which there is no time to

Digitized by Google

complete, because of the need for instant action. When we wish to describe promptitude, we say: "No sooner said than done." But here the words are not fully uttered at all. The language of deliberation is cut short, by sudden and swift and effectual action. Let it be supposed that this is only a dramatised representation of what happened; still it must be assumed to preserve the spirit of what occurred. How dull must our eyes be, if we cannot understand the purport of what is so dramatically set forth. This striking picture is unintelligible if it do not convey the intimation of divine promptitude to guard against a real and fearful peril. Surely it is not derogatory to God to represent him as moving with alacrity when there is good to be given or ill to be prevented! Let us hold to it then, as a broad, bold, undeniable fact, that this account shows Jehovah God in wise, loving, unflinching haste to take man away from the tree of life.

For the moment we ask not the reason for this: we are first concerned with the fact. Let us try to express the fact in words. Remember how we have been led up to it. We have had: Immortality provided; immortality reserved; immortality conditioned; —and now we have nothing less startling than, IMMORTALITY PREVENTED!

We do not say, Prevented utterly and for ever. We do not affirm that the way will never more be thrown open. We do not allege that in this divinely prompt procedure—word and action melted into one in the fire of holy zeal—we have judgment without mercy. What we do say is: Qualify it as you may, you cannot alter the fact in its plain and bold significance. God banishes man from the tree of life that he may NOT take and eat and live for ever.

Let us mark well the How, before we advance to the Why. Observe the manner both ways, negatively and positively. Mark how God does *not* effect his object. He does not issue a second prohibition, and in words forbid the fruit of the tree of life, as he previously forbade the fruit of the tree for the discerning of good and evil. And this is in nowise surprising. Man has broken one command: it will be little for him to break another. His appetite for wrong is whetted. He has run the risk of death, moreover; and what more obvious, little as he may understand of the mysterious power of the tree of life, than flee to it for safety? Man is not to be trusted: God will make no experiments—he will run no risk. Man shall have no chance of going wrong with regard to the tree of life. Mark, again, that God does not destroy the tree. This he might have done; since he who creates can destroy. He might have done it: might have instantly, with a word, withered and wasted it to its roots; scorched its fruit to cinders, or turned them to ashes and scattered them to the winds; might have caused its cracked and creaking branches to formulate the wild winds into the wailing words: "Too late! no endless life for thee, now!" Or, without destroying the tree, he might have withdrawn its virtue;

Digitized by Google

or placed some obstacle in the way of its effectual appropriation; and might then have stationed by it an angel of death, with no drawn sword, but only a commission to say: "Take of this second tree, if thou wilt; but know, fallen man, that now, in thy sin and under thy curse, thou shalt take and eat in vain!"

And now let us mark how God *does* accomplish his purpose. He expels the man from the garden in which the tree of life stands—an act which, in the circumstances, requires no comment. But more than this. As though there were a likelihood—or at least a possibility—that, drawn by hope or driven by fear, man may desperately attempt a forcible re-entry, in order at all hazards to get at the tree of life; therefore, to make quite sure that this shall not be done,—the merciful Jehovah God places in front of the garden, to bar and keep the way of the tree of life, the cherubim, and the brandishing sword-flame. How wonderful! How terrible! We can understand the effectiveness of the guard kept by the flashing, turning, projecting, restlessly threatening flame of fire. But out of so terrific a guard we could extract little hope, did we not know that "even our God is a consuming fire." But what of the cherubim? Ay, what of them? *This:* if we rightly decipher them. By the simplest derivation of the word, "cherub" means "seized," "possessed." By the entire tenour of biblical indication, the possession is neither demoniac nor satanic, but divine: a cherub is a living being possessed of God—instinct with his will. The cherubim of the Bible—the cherubim themselves, of course, not the copies of them—are the living throne and chariot of the Most High. So we read: "Thou that inhabitest the cherubim, shine forth" (Ps. lxxx. 1); "the chariot of the cherubim" (1 Chron. xxviii. 18); "he rode upon a cherub and did fly; yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind" (Ps. xviii. 10). And surely it is something to remember the central fact of the tent and temple worship: The cherubim cover the *mercy-seat*. He who inhabits the cherubim, is not only a sin-consuming, but also a propitious, sinner-covering and sinner-sparing God. Let us firmly grasp these teachings. *God* is in the cherubim. *God* takes up his abode at the entrance of Paradise Lost. *God* takes charge of the tree of life. And, consuming fire though he is, his name is Love. Surely it is something to find him here, and here enthroned! Is it possible that, after all, this very throne is a throne of grace? that mercy is here dispensed, and hope encouraged? Let us see. In the first place, we know that, after the expulsion, the first family offered sacrifice to God; in the next, that the divine acceptance of Abel's offering and rejection of Cain's were at once so certainly known that the countenance of the latter fell in vexation in presence of the undeniable fact; and, then, in the third place, we know that, when Cain was banished from the spot on which the expelled family had so far dwelt and worshipped, he counted it as the climax of his punishment that he had to leave the presence of

Digitized by Google

Jehovah—a presence which even he could recognise, a presence which even for him had an inextinguishable charm as though full of infantile and youthful memories of all that was good and gracious and merciful and long-suffering in God. And therefore, in view of our previous identification of the cherubim as God's throne, we feel to be amply warranted in the conclusion that that throne, while certainly a throne of judgment, was at the same time not less a throne of grace. The face of him who inhabited the cherubim had indeed shined forth with the charm of infinite love. Need we say then, in an expulsion thus effectuated and sealed, there lies a living germ of hope? There is no possibility of breaking through to the tree of life: be it so, it is something that the tree of life remains—everything that the throne of judgment is a throne of grace.

* JOSEPH B. ROTHERHAM.

*(To be continued.)*

---

## THE DOGMA OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION, IS IT OF MAN OR OF GOD?

BY GENERAL GOODWYN.

I. THE late Mr. Henry Dunn asked the following question:—"Why is it that Christian people read the Bible so differently? that conflicting sects alike appeal to it as the sole authority for their respective views? that doctrines the most diverse are supposed to be equally well sustained by its statements?" He gives the following reply, gained from no small experience; that the reason "may be found in the prevailing neglect of the Bible *as a whole* arising from mere fragmentary reading; in the confounding of *revealed facts* with *human inferences;* in the habit of *accommodating* Scripture, or *perverting* it by exaggeration or misapplication of texts; in *allegorising* under the influence of an unbridled fancy; in the *abuse* of parallel passages; in the *neglect* and consequent *abuse* of unfulfilled prophecy; in *inattention* to the character of the dispensation under which we are living:" and it may be added, in a *tenacious clinging* to some merely traditional tenets. Here is enough to stimulate a searching of the heart in order satisfactorily to render an answer to the question at the head of this paper.

II. In the endeavour to assist in a conscientious inquiry after the truth,—which is all that I pretend to,—it is imperatively necessary first of all to ascertain the condition in which men were who lived in ages previous to the advent of the Incarnate Son sent from God to save "whosoever should believe" on him. These must be divided into two classes. (1) Those who had personal intercourse with God, such as some of the patriarchs and other "holy

Digitized by Google

men of old" both before and after the flood; together with such as were educated in a knowledge of God, as the nation of Israel. (2) Those heathen who were intuitively conscious of one true God, having moreover the evidence of "his eternal power and Godhead" in the works of creation. Human beings therefore "*are without excuse*" for not glorifying the Creator as God. (Rom. i. 19-21.) None of these men knew or heard of a Christ, the Son of God who had died unto sin and had glorified God in the work of redemption. If therefore any of these are to be saved, on what principle and under what circumstances must their salvation have been ordained? Let us inquire of "the law and the testimony."

III. It must be borne in mind that, whatever may have been *the purpose* of God in the past, before Christ came, in regard to the redemption of men of old, they themselves were quite unconscious of it in so far as to be able to say, "We have peace with God," or we "have passed from death unto life." Even Israel was not conscious, inwardly, of salvation, for we are expressly told that their "sacrifices could not make him that did the service perfect *as pertaining to the conscience*," for "it was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins." (Heb. ix. 8-10; x. 1-4.) The first acquaintance of man with his reconciliation to God was when the Saviour himself, after his resurrection, pronounced the word "Peace" to his disciples, "breathed on them," and gave them his Holy Spirit to dwell in their hearts (John xx. 19); having come direct from the Presence of God, where he had displayed, like a divine Aaron, the blood and the incense of his *living* Person, tokens of his finished work, and had become *accepted* as the surety and ransom for sinners (compare John xx. 17, 20 with Levit. xvi.). If therefore men of old were forgiven their sins, or justified, it must have been a reserved act *of God in view of* his eternal Lamb, "slain before the foundation of the world," and of his foreknowledge of the *manifestation* of the death of the Lamb to "take away the sin of the world." Thus it is that "the righteousness of God is *now revealed* in the forgiveness of *sins that are past*" (Rom. iii. 25), revealed *to us* by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven since the resurrection and acceptance of Jesus Christ. The question now is, whose sins were thus registered in heaven as forgiven? and further, under what circumstances, how and when will they become consciously blessed with the assurance of their salvation?

IV. First of those under class (1) § II. Of them it is prefiguratively shown, or positively declared, that "Righteousness was imputed" to them, that they "received a good report." They were justified through faith in "things not seen" *up to the light they possessed of those things;* but more particularly through belief *in God to the extent to which it pleased him dispensationally to reveal himself.* But being only justified *then*, it was *in order to* eternal life in the future, for that life has its source in the risen Son of

Digitized by Google

God (1 John v. 11), and cannot be otherwise obtained than on the principle of faith in him. "*If*," as Paul says, "there had been a law given *which could have given life*, verily righteousness should have been by the law." (Gal. iii. 21.) But there was not.

V. I will now investigate briefly the nature of the righteousness divinely imputed to a believing man, an imputation that proceeds on the ground of man—as a sinner—being naked sinful flesh, i.e., naturally evil both in his own eyes and in the eyes of all who see him; destitute of all power or wisdom to alter his condition, and possessing nothing of a moral covering to hide an evil nature whilst yet a tenant of such sinful flesh. This is primarily illustrated in the case of Adam and Eve. The covering of fig-leaves, self-assumed, was of no value in Adam's own eyes, for no sooner did he hear the voice of God in the garden than he attempted to hide himself; what an impotent abomination then must it not have been in the sight of the Creator! No. If man is to be clothed with a garment that shall present an acceptable appearance to Divine Holiness, and at the same time soothe a conscience alive to its necessity because of sin and death, it must be provided by him against whom the sinner has offended, who alone can estimate that which is adequate for the purpose. Such a garment was that with which Adam and Eve were prefiguratively clothed of God; a garment that doubtless had its origin in the death of a creature—judging from analogy though not mentioned—slain as a representative sacrifice. This garment God could look on with complacency, for it signified *to him* "the blessedness of the man whose iniquities are forgiven, whose sin *is* covered." (Psa. xxxii. 1, 2.) There must have been some germ of faith that procured this covering, and I think it may be found in Adam's recognition of *the necessity* of it during the period of his existence under the judicial sentence of death; but also in his belief that in Eve was the seed that should destroy the devil and ultimately abolish sin and death; the seed also of all who should possess life according to the divine estimation of the blessing. I say that *the germ* of such faith may be found in the words divinely given to him (Gen. iii. 20), whilst the acknowledgment of the need of the covering should be to him a seal of righteousness imputed of which that garment of skin was the symbol.

The case of Abraham shows an advanced stage in the work of imputation by means of a parallel transaction. The patriarch had "found" something "as pertaining to the flesh," something that should avail him whilst, like Adam, still in a state of temporary existence though "through fear of death subject to bondage." (Heb. ii. 15.) He, like Adam, again, could place no reliance for self-justification on figleaf works, nor could God justify him thereby. Of this patriarch it is said that he "believed *God*," and that such "faith" on him who had made himself known as "the God of glory," and had invested the promised inheritance with such a halo of blessedness as to the future (Acts vii. 1-7; Gen. xvii. 1-8), "was

Digitized by Google

imputed to him for righteousness;" "the seal" of appropriation of "him who quickeneth the dead and calleth those things which be not as though they were," i.e., in view of a period when *in resurrection* he should be made *conscious* of salvation in life. (Rom. iv. 1-3, 11-22.) I need scarcely pursue this matter further; the eleventh chapter of Hebrews supplies a list of Old Testament saints whose sins have been covered on the ground of faith *in God* only, a divine record unknown to them of old, but revealed to us through the Holy Spirit sent down from the council chamber of the Godhead. These all were "shut up unto *the* faith that should afterward be revealed;" a faith, not *in God* only, but "*on him who should raise up Jesus our Lord from the dead*" (Rom. iv. 24); such a faith is known to us now, it will be known to them when in resurrection "they shall look on him that was pierced." (Gal. iii. 22, 23.) The "spirits" of these "just," or justified men now in the safe keeping of "God who gave them," will be "made perfect" in union with resurrection bodies (Heb. xii. 23), but in their appointed order (Heb. xi. 40; 1 Cor. xv. 23); an event which we now realise *by faith*. Thus a principle is revealed by which we may understand how all such men who, previous to the first Advent of Christ, believed *in God* according to the mode by which he presented himself to their respective notice, received the imputation of righteousness, or were justified in order to eternal life in the future.

VI. I proceed now to investigate the case of those heathen to whom there was not—nor is even now—any other manifestation of the Godhead beyond the works of creation surrounding them, more particularly referred to by the Apostle Paul in Romans i. They belong to class (2) of § II., in reference to whom it is true that God has never left himself without a witness on earth. Creation in its varied forms and wonders is for ever a testimony to his life-giving power, wisdom, and Godhead. (Psalm xix. 1-6.) This evidence that he fills all things in creative and sustaining power, is and has been present to every eye and every heart not fenced by the insanity of *wilful* ignorance against the manifestations of divine glory. Such wilful sinners are therefore "*without excuse*" (Rom. i. 19, 20); the knowledge of God which was originally common to mankind, is charged against repudiating atheists as guilt, for "when *they knew* God, they glorified him not as God." This condemnation, however, is not of universal application, but necessarily in righteousness limited to such who come under the above class as *wilful* rejectors of God. Doubtless there have been multitudes in different parts of the earth who, *knowing* God as the Almighty Good Spirit filling creation "with life and breath and all things, giving rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling men's hearts with food and gladness" (Acts xiv. 17; xvii. 25), have "sought him if haply they might feel after him," worshipping him according to their instinctive comprehension. These

Digitized by Google

therefore, though not possessing the knowledge of imputed righteousness even, must surely be justified of God in the exercise of impartial equity. It is said that "the times of this ignorance God winked at, and *suffered* all nations to walk in their own ways;" *suffered*, because until Christ came the probation of man, as to any inherent possibility of the flesh, was incomplete (Gal. iii. 24, 25). But God had ever in view the coming fulfilment of his eternal counsels by the work of redemption when he would record in "the Book of life of the Lamb slain *before the foundation of the world*," the "forgiveness of sins *that are past*." (Rom. iii. 25.) Such a class as those above alluded to will surely be saved; but WHEN will they become *conscious* of salvation? This is a most important point in our inquiry, the right and consistent view of which will depend on whether the statements in the next section (§ VII.) are in accordance with Scripture. Before commencing which a preliminary remark is necessary.

The seventh verse of the first chapter of the Book of the Revelation of Jesus Christ is as follows: "Behold! he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also who pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." *Every eye* shall look on him who was pierced. Not only those "who pierced him," which are but an *especial* number of the *whole class* described by "*every eye*."* Amongst those eyes that look on the Son of God when "he cometh with clouds" must necessarily be those belonging to all such as shall be saved in "the first resurrection," those who having been justified *in the counsels of God*, are raised from among the dead at the appearance of Christ in the power and glory of his kingdom, that they, like Thomas of old, may see, believe, and *at that time* become *conscious* of their salvation. This resurrection is perfectly distinct from that of "the rest of the dead," which "live not again till the thousand years" of the great day of the Lord shall have passed. (Rev. xx. 5, 6.)

VII. I have thus stated the case of those of the past ages who, I believe, will be saved. Of the present, we know that they are a body *gathered out from* the world of Jews and Gentiles *to* Christ risen and glorified as the Divine Head: "an election of grace" whilst the world, as such, lies under the condemnation of its prince, "the wicked one." (John xvi. 8-11; 1 John v. 19.) Now as to those who shall be made *consciously* aware of their salvation in the future, such as belong to neither of the above named classes. What future? Here let me pause, if peradventure I may hold up to those who entertain the thought of divine forgiveness in some age yet to

* The grammar of the sentence demands this, there being a general statement followed by καὶ οἵτινες ("Revelation from Ancient Sources." S. P. Tregelles). See my work on "The Revelation of Jesus Christ." Chap. 11, p. 315.

Digitized by Google

come, but which I have never seen or heard clearly defined, an image of their conception. I imagine that a great number of believers in eternal life obtainable only as a gift of God through faith in Jesus Christ, seeing scripturally, that the number of saved individuals in this age—a parenthetic one between two portions of Israel's history—is limited to those who are to form the peculiar body of Christ, the ἐκκλησία of Scripture; being further impressed with the idea that, when this age closes Christ will come and immediately establish the judicial court of final award for all men, are thereby driven to the conclusion that so disproportionate a mass of the race of mankind cannot justly be condemned to perdition, and that consequently there must be forgiveness somewhere, somehow, at some period beyond that of the great judgment.

But if, instead of the above traditional impression, a deeper search into Scripture under the clearness of an unbiassed mind and pure desire to be acquainted with the dispensational purposes of God in the exact simplicity in which he has been pleased to write them; if, I say, the Word of God should reveal another and more glorious design of his manifold wisdom, a rich and righteous provision for the reconciliation of a multitudinous host, even "as the stars of heaven," according to the promise to Abraham, "*so* shall thy seed be" (Gen. xv. 5 with Rom. iv. 14-18): if there should be found to intervene between the glorious advent of Christ and the judgment of final award before "the Great White Throne," a period wherein there shall be a *manifestation of a personal* administration of the government of the earth by the Son of Man: if such an administration be discovered to have a judicial character *for a distinct purpose*, viz., *the fulfilment* of a divine promise for the constitution of the resuscitated and restored nation of Israel into "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exod. xix. 5, 6; Heb. viii. 8-13), and through them, as the seed of Abraham, a fulfilment of another promise that "all nations of the earth should be blessed" by the sound of the glad tidings of salvation, there would surely be a joyful reversal of opinion in accord with the revelation of God!

*(To be continued.)*

---

## THE PREDICTED MILLENNIUM.

THE coming of Christ, the resurrection of the holy dead, the setting up of his kingdom, and his universal and everlasting reign, are the main elements in the great Bible doctrine of the millennium; around which all the teachings of Moses and the

* A concise account of the several judicial tribunals of Scripture will be found in a pamphlet of mine, entitled, "the Judgment Seat of Christ." (Elliot Stock.)

Digitized by Google

prophets, of Christ and his apostles, cluster. This doctrine is presented in varied forms—in plain, simple language that a child could understand—in the most poetic figures and imagery, and in the most holy and sublime symbolical representations. This doctrine underlies the whole system of revealed truth. It is the golden thread that binds all in one harmonious whole; and to the throne of God itself. The revelation of the Christ and the restitution of all things, for the hope of Israel, and is the only hope of this sin-stricken and sin-oppressed world.

That the Lord Jesus, who once visited our earth, is to return to it again, must be perfectly obvious to every attentive reader of the Scriptures. No unprejudiced mind can contemplate the numerous announcements of that grand and imposing scene, and remain in doubt. Enoch, before the flood, saw him in the enormous distance of ages descending from heaven with myriads of his holy ones. Patriarchs and prophets saw him—conversed with him—wrote of him—and affirm in the most positive terms, that he is to stand in the latter day upon the earth. The apostles take up the story of his coming, and glory in the prospect; and the Lord Jesus himself adds the sanction of his own name in the declaration, "Behold I come." But for what purpose is he to come?

Some maintain that he will not come till the end of all things, and of time itself; and then simply to judge the world, and award its destinies. Others affirm his coming to be pre-millennial, for the renovation of the earth, the resurrection of the holy dead, the introduction of the latter day glory, and the setting up of his kingdom.

Every argument and every objection that can be urged against the coming of Christ before the millennium, lies with equal weight against his coming at the end of it to judge the world. This can as easily be done without his supervision, as the things to be done at the beginning of that long period. If the glowing representations of his coming to set up his kingdom and his reign, as King in Zion and over all nations, are to be turned into figures of speech, into fable and allegory—if an ethereal sense is to be assigned to them, and they are to be taken spiritually—why not carry out the principle? Why not apply this rule to the interpretation of those Scriptures which describe the process of the last judgment? If his reign is to be purely spiritual, why is not his judgment to be spiritual? If what is said of his coming before the millennium is to be taken figuratively, why is not what is said of his coming at the end of it to be taken in the same sense? Accordingly the bold step has been made by a late writer, who maintains that "the second coming of Christ, with its associate events, the end of the world, the resurrection of the dead, and the general judgment, must already have taken place, and all expectation of these events as still future, is forbidden by the Scriptures." The whole argument is based on the commonly received notion of a spiritual reign.

Digitized by Google

How then is the grand problem to be solved? Let us see. The high priesthood of Christ was established on his first coming. He executed that office in the one offering and sacrifice of himself. That coming was a real personal coming. His life and death were visible realities. And the shedding of his blood, the great atonement for sin, a most wonderful reality. How then comes it to pass, that his second coming to execute his kingly office is to be any the less real, visible, and personal? How significant the title, "The Prince of the kings of the earth." When revealed from heaven he is to take to himself his great power and reign. Then will be fully answered the prayer so oft and earnestly repeated, "Thy kingdom come." And this is the declared purpose of his coming.

In the memorable prophecy of Jacob the setting up of his future kingdom is already indicated. Judah is now prostrate, but lies as a couching lion, "Shiloh will rouse him up, and to him shall the gathering of the people be." This is yet to be verified. How wonderful the words of Balaam, "Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion;" and the shout of a king is among them. I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh; there shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel. A man shall come of his sons and his arm shall rule many people; and his kingdom shall be higher than Gog, and his kingdom shall be exalted." We quote this passage (Num. vii. 24) as it stands in the Septuagint, which is doubtless the true reading. A change of seven letters in the Hebrew text restores this meaning to it. What the empire of Gog is to be in the latter days may be seen in Ezekiel. Messiah is to triumph over the embattled legions of this tremendous power in the day that his feet shall stand on the Mount of Olives; for he will then plead with all nations for his people. "The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake, but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel." Then will it be known that he is the Lord dwelling in the holy city; and that "the time has come for the saints to take the kingdom, and to possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever." How magnificent are some of the songs in celebration of this grand consummation:

"The Lord shall send forth the sceptre of thy might
From Zion, rule thou in the midst of thine enemies;
Nevertheless I was ordained king
On Zion, my holy mount.
For out of Zion shall go forth the law,
And the word of the Lord from Jerusalem,
And he shall judge among the Gentiles,
And shall rebuke many peoples.

In the day of thy power shall thy people offer
Free will offerings in the glorious sanctuary.
Oh, sing unto the Lord a new song,
Sing unto the Lord all the earth.

Digitized by Google

Declare his glory among the Gentiles,
His wonders among all peoples.
Honour and majesty are before him,
Strength and beauty are in his sanctuary;
Give unto the Lord, oh, ye kindreds of the people,
Give unto the Lord glory and strength;
Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name,
Bring an offering and come into his courts;
Oh, worship the Lord in the glorious sanctuary.
The king of Tarshish and of the Isles shall bring presents;
The kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts;
Yea, all kings shall fall down before him,
All nations shall do him service,
For thy temple's sake at Jerusalem,
So shall kings bring presents unto thee.

And it shall come to pass in the last days,
That the mount of the Lord's house shall be established
On the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted
Above the hills, and all the Gentiles shall flow unto it;
And many people shall go thither and say,
Come, let us go up to the mount of the Lord,
To the house of the God of Jacob,
And he will teach us concerning his ways,
And we will walk in his paths."

It would seem to be perfectly obvious that the references here made to the Lord's house, and the glorious sanctuary, must be understood of the splendour and magnificence of the temple described by Ezekiel, to be built in those days of blessedness and peace. How remarkable the faith, and explicit the testimony of Tobias and his son Tobit, even while in captivity at Nineveh! "Surely . . . our brethren shall be scattered . . . from that good land; and Jerusalem shall be desolate; and the house of God in it shall be burned. . . . And that, again, God shall have mercy on them, and bring them again into the land where they shall build a temple, but not like the first, until the time of that age be fulfilled; and afterward they shall return from all places of their captivity, and build up Jerusalem gloriously, and the house of God shall be built in it for ever, with a glorious building. . . . And all nations shall turn and fear the Lord God truly, and shall bury their idols . . . And the Lord shall exalt his people. . . . Oh Jerusalem, the holy city! . . praise the everlasting King, that his tabernacle may be builded in thee again with joy. Many nations shall come from far to the name of the Lord God, with gifts in their hands. Blessed are they who love thee, . . . blessed are they who have been sorrowful for thee, . . . bless God the great King. . . . For Jerusalem shall be built up with sapphires, and emeralds, and precious stones; thy walls and towers and battlements with pure gold, and the streets of Jerusalem shall be paved with beryl and carbuncle and stones of Ophir. And all her streets shall say Alleluia; and they shall praise him, saying, Blessed be God. . . . who hath extolled it for ever."

How like some of the magnificent representations of John. Such

Digitized by Google

was the faith of the pious remnant of Israel centuries before the Messiah came in the flesh. They believed that he would come and finally establish his kingdom on earth; gather the whole house of Israel, and bless the nation. And such is the teaching of Paul; and this teaching accords with the whole current of Scripture. Not a line, word or letter, not one jot or tittle of its pure pages, no expression, no intimation even, is to be found of an opposite character.

Christ told his sorrowing disciples that when the Son of Man should come in his glory, they, who had followed him, in the regeneration should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. They are to be princes in his future kingdom. And the establishment of this kingdom is the hope of Israel; and the only hope of this sin-oppressed world. When I say the only hope, I do not mean that no others are indulged. Many are sanguine in the expectation that present means and instrumentalities are to convert and save the race. But I mean that the coming and reign of Christ is the only hope presented in the Gospel. And every other is doomed to bitter disappointment.—*Prophetic Times.*

---

## PRAYER.

"Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."—Matt. xviii. 20.

THY blessed promise, gracious Lord,
Leads us to meet and pray;
Come to us with the gifts of love,
O, come and with us stay!

Thy throne of glory condescends,
In its effulgent place,
To hear the melody of hearts
Around thy throne of grace.

The love that glows unseen by men,
Is holy to the Lord,
Who grants his presence where his name
Is lovingly adored.

We therefore pray, our Saviour loved,
That we thy voice may hear,
Speaking in grace to every heart,
As we to thee draw near.

We gather round thy gracious throne,
To have our wants supplied;
And, thus supplied, we shall rejoice,
Whilst thou art glorified.

W. L.

Digitized by Google

# THE SON OF MAN JUDGING THE NATIONS.

MATT. xxv. 31-46.

HOW often have we heard this in whole or in part preached from, but always as being a description of the general judgment consequent on the general resurrection. This has been taken for granted as a thing quite fixed, determined, and never to be called in question. And this is not to be wondered at considering that Drs. Doddridge, Whitby, Macknight, Benson, and other commentators have so interpreted the subject. And this they concluded they were right in doing because the Saviour in one place speaks of the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked in the same sentence, without making any distinction as to time. "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man. Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

Because in this passage the resurrection of all is predicted in the same sentence, it has been inferred that it will be at the same time, or at all events in the same day or hour, and that the separation of the persons in the paragraph in Matthew, represented by the sheep and the goats, and divided into two great classes, one on the right and the other on the left of the Judge, takes place consequent thereon. And this argument would have considerable weight on the following suppositions: that is, 1st. Supposing the paragraph spake of the *dead*, or of their being *raised* to life. 2nd. Supposing that two events mentioned in the same sentence in prophecy have always happened together. 3rd. Supposing there are other sentences in Scripture in which the righteous and the wicked are represented as being raised together, and then separated as in the paragraph. And 4th. Supposing that there are no instances in Scripture in which the resurrection of the just is represented as taking place without any reference to the unjust. If these suppositions can be supported by Scripture authority, then there are strong grounds for believing that the passage before us is a description of the general judgment, and that the popular interpretation thereof, which we have from childhood been taught by preachers and commentators to believe, is correct.

But now we have to take these several suppositions and consider them separately, and see if they can be supported by Scripture authority.

In the closing paragraph of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew is there anything said about the dead, or of their being raised to life? Not one word. And it is rather singular that the persons



Digitized by Google

here called "sheep" and "goats," are previously described as *nations*. "And he, the Son of Man, shall sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered *all nations*." In other places, where the resurrection of the dead is spoken of in general terms, and the judgment consequent thereon, the persons raised and judged are never called nations, but simply they that are in their graves, and the dead. If the paragraph under consideration was intended to represent the general judgment as consequent on the general resurrection, we are unable to account for this difference, especially as this paragraph says nothing at all about the dead, or their resurrection. The first supposition is, therefore, we submit, a failure.

Now let us look at the second. We have seen from John that the resurrection of two classes of persons is there spoken of by the Saviour in the same sentence—they that have done good and they that have done evil, and that without any distinction as to time, and therefore may take place together, supposing it to be a general rule as applied to prophecy, that when two events are spoken of in the same sentence, they are to happen together, at the same literal moment, hour, or day. If this can be shown to be a uniform rule, then it will be proof that the righteous and the wicked are raised together and separated, one class being placed on the right hand, and the other on the left hand of the Judge. But is this the uniform rule? In other words, are there any instances in Scripture in which two or more events are mentioned in the same prophecy, which have uniformly taken place together, or at the same period of time? Or rather perhaps we might ask are there any instances in which two or more events are predicted in the same sentence one of which has been accomplished and the other remains to be accomplished? And if so, what space as to time has there been between them? It is well known that many of the prophecies are so framed as to have primary and remote fulfilment. Israel is called God's son, his firstborn whom he called out of Egypt. (Exod. iv. 22, 23.) And the prophet Hosea (ii. 1) says, "When Israel was a child then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." And 1,490 years before the birth of Christ Israel was literally called out of Egypt. And 740 years before the birth of Christ the prophet uttered the words just quoted. Soon after the birth of Christ, "Joseph being warned of God in a dream, arose and took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt, and was there until the death of Herod, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my Son." See what periods of time elapsed between these events! Again, the Saviour read in the synagogue of Nazareth, part of Isaiah lxi., about his preaching the acceptable year of the Lord, and said to the people who heard him, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." Referring to himself and gospel times, he read the first verse, and part of the second; the next sen-

Digitized by Google

tence is, "the day of vengeance of our God." This he did not read, but closed the book. He knew that this did not apply to that time. He knew that though in Isa. lxi. 2 the expressions, "the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God" were joined together, yet that they would not happen together. Eighteen hundred years have rolled away since the first event happened, but the second event, "the day of vengeance of our God," has not yet arrived. This being so, the resurrection of them that have done good and of them that have done evil, though predicted by the Saviour in the same sentence, may be equally far asunder as to time. So that this prediction affords no confirmation that the "all nations" which are to be gathered before the throne of the glory of Christ are the dead, or that their being then separated, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, and his setting the one on his right hand and the other on his left, are persons who have been raised from the dead. So that the second supposition is, we submit, as complete a failure as the first.

Now let us try the third supposition, and inquire whether there are any instances in Scripture in which the righteous and the wicked are represented as being raised at the same time, and then separated the one from the other? If there be anything of the sort in the New Testament we cannot find it. In Rev. xx. we find the "first resurrection" expressly mentioned, and as taking place a thousand years before the second resurrection and last judgment. But even here the people to be raised and judged are not called nations; it is simply said, "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God." It is not even mentioned whether they were righteous or wicked; it is simply said, "the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books according to their works." Nothing even here is hinted about their being separated one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, or of the one being placed on the right hand and the other on the left. So that if when the Son of Man cometh in his glory and all the holy angels with him, and sits upon the throne of his glory, and before him he gathers all nations, if by these "all nations" be meant the dead of all preceding ages, is it not unaccountable that there is no description like it in the whole of the New Testament? We can find then no satisfactory ground for the third supposition.

Now let us try the fourth. Are there any instances in Scripture in which the resurrection of the just is represented as taking place without any reference to the unjust? The general answer to this question is that the instances are many. We begin with Luke xiv. 12-14. The Saviour being invited to a feast said to him that bade him, "When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbours, lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense he made thee.



Digitized by Google

But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind, and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Not a word here about the resurrection of the unjust. Again, the Sadducees having brought before the Saviour the case of the woman who, according to their story, had had seven husbands, and wishing to know whose wife she would be in the resurrection, answers them as follows: "The children of this world marry and are given in marriage. But they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Here there is not a word about the resurrection of any but the children of God. Then there is 1 Cor. xv., which constitutes the most prominent part of the burial service of the Church of England. The whole of this long chapter, so far as it relates to the resurrection, is confined to the righteous. Then there is 1 Thess. iv. 13 and following verses, where the apostle makes no allusion to the resurrection of any except the dead in Christ at his coming, and the instantaneous change of the living saints, and of their being taken away to be for ever with the Lord. And in Rev. xx. a first resurrection is mentioned as taking place a thousand years before the second or last, preparatory to the last judgment.

Now, in all these instances the resurrection of the just is spoken of, not in connection with the unjust, but as a separate transaction. The fourth supposition therefore fails, like all the preceding ones. Hence, the Saviour's having predicted the resurrection of all men, the just and the unjust, in the same sentence is no argument that they will rise together and be separated the one from the other and placed one on his right hand and the other on his left, as set forth in Matthew; or that such paragraphs have any reference at all to the general judgment as consequent on the resurrection.

## SUMMARY.

It may be useful to condense the argument. It stands thus. In the passage it is said, "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them the one from the other, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on the left," and then pronounce sentence on them separately. This has been by commentators and preachers almost universally taken for granted as a thing fixed, certain, and never to be questioned, as descriptive of the general judgment both of the righteous and the wicked. And that was so intended it has been supposed is confirmed by the fact

Digitized by Google

that the Saviour in one place predicts the resurrection of all mankind in the same sentence, without any distinction as to time. But in order to make this prediction of the Saviour confirmatory of the interpretation contended for of the last paragraph of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, four suppositions must be established. These we have seen all fail. We can find no Scripture authority to support them. The persons spoken of are called "nations," "all nations," and nothing is said about the dead, or their being raised to life. And the dead are never spoken of in other parts of Scripture as nations, but simply as the dead, or all that are in their graves. And we have seen that it is no uncommon thing at all for two events to be mentioned or referred to in the same prophecy without any distinction as to time, and yet for one of them to happen hundreds of years before the other. So that the fact of the Saviour's predicting the resurrection of all mankind in the same sentence is no evidence that the righteous and the wicked will rise from the dead together, and then be separated the one from another, and the former placed on his right hand and the other on his left; while we have seen that there are numerous instances in which the resurrection of the just is spoken of separately, and without any reference to the resurrection or judgment of the unjust.

### REMARKS.

From this summary will be seen some of the difficulties growing out of the interpretation of the last paragraph of Matthew xxv., as applying to the resurrection of the just and unjust. We say *some* of the difficulties, for there are others we have now not time to consider, but propose doing so shortly.

We have been speaking of the future judgment of the righteous. Not that there is by nature any righteous—no, not one. All alike are sinners before God. But amongst these there are some, who, yielding to the convictions of the Holy Spirit, have been led to see and feel their sinfulness, and have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before them, whose trust for salvation is not in themselves or in any of their doings, but in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, "though he was rich, for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich." These are made, constituted, and treated as righteous in God's sight. And holding fast the beginning of their confidence stedfast unto the end, it hath great recompence of reward. We believe that the only judgment which awaits them is the summary judgment of rewards according to works, and that those rewards will be awarded at the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the just. Then,

> "Arrayed in glorious grace,
> Shall their vile bodies shine,
> And every form and every face
> Be heavenly and divine."

Digitized by Google

They have been turned from idols to serve the living God: and what next? Why, to wait for his Son from heaven. To wait

"Till that illustrious morning come.
When all the saints shall rise,
And, decked in never-fading bloom,
Attend him to the skies."

A. B. C.

---

# "THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY COME TO PASS."

REVELATION i. 1.

No. VIII.

*(Continued from August.)*

## THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST.

IT was not to announce some new truth that Peter wrote, "Judgment must begin at the house of God," but rather to warn "them that had obtained like precious faith with him" that the time for its fulfilment drew near, for we take the true reading of 1 Pet. iv. 17 to be as we find it in the Emphatic Diaglott version, "Because the season is coming for the judgment to begin from the house of God." Upon this principle God has acted all along the ages, and has declared his purpose yet to act, even as his eternal purposes are grounded upon unchanging principles. Israel came under judgment in Egypt before Egypt came under judgment in the Red Sea. Through Isaiah we were told, "It shall come to pass when the Lord hath performed his whole work—of judgment—upon Mount Zion and on Jerusalem, that he will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks." (Isa. x. 12.) The same truth we get also in Jer. xxv. 29, Ezek. ix. 6, Mal. iii. 5, and—as we shall hereafter note—Zech. xiv. 2, 3. "He will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle, and half the city shall go into captivity.—Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations that have fought against Jerusalem." We note this as God's order of procedure as we now approach the subject of the Judgment Seat of Christ.

"For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works." (Matt. xvi. 27.) And then shall be heard "great voices in heaven saying, The kingdom over the world is become our Lord's and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever. And the four-and-twenty elders which sat before God on their thrones fell upon their faces and worshipped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art and wast, because thou has taken thy great might, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thine anger came, and the time of the dead to be judged, and to give their reward unto thy servants the

Digitized by Google

prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, the small and the great, and to destroy them that destroy the earth." (See Alford, Rev. xi. 15-18.)

We adopt the term "judgment seat" because it is scriptural, and we are anxious to abide by the letter while we attempt to give expression to the spirit of Scripture. But our readers must endeavour to dissociate their minds from all ideas of a judgment seat such as that before which offenders alone appear, and after examination receive sentence of condemnation or acquittal. The judgment seat we are about to consider is rather a tribunal such as that before which competitive examinations are held, and where the question is one of greater or less reward. This should at once relieve our subject from the objections which are almost sure to arise in some minds. And that we may the better understand the need for such, and the place the judgment seat must fill in the divine economy as that which shall determine the ultimate of our race, may it not be well to look back awhile and consider our original?

Man to be created in the likeness of God must needs become possessed of a tripartite nature comprising spirit, soul, and body. In *spirit* like to the Father the source of power to will and to do, compassing all, penetrating all; infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being; an emanation from such is the *spirit in man*. In *soul* (or breath) like to the wind that first moved upon the waters, reducing chaos to order; then as a breath breathed into the nostrils of the newly formed man constituting him a living soul (i.e., a *breathing* life, in contrast to vegetable life); and eventually in the same order of manifestation, came upon the newly formed assembly "as a mighty rushing wind" constituting the many units a living unity. In *body* like to The Word, the first-begotten, the brightness of the Father's glory, the express image of his person, in the bosom of the Father's love, "as one brought up with him, daily his delight, rejoicing always before him, while as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world." Thus we have man in his tripartite nature of spirit, soul, and body, expressive of the Creator in a trinity of persons, "The Father, The Word, and the Holy Ghost." (1 John v. 7.)*

To man alone, of all the creatures God had made, he gave to the spirit as the responsible part of his being a threefold faculty, Conscience, Will, and Power. Conscience to know, Will to do, and Power to exercise that will, thus fitting him to occupy a middle stage between the Creator and creation, becoming therein at once the Creator's worshipper and creation's king. From him, then, was demanded obedience, and as a *test*, one tree among the many planted in his garden came under the prohibition, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Disobedience resulted,

* Since writing the above we have met with a new and ingenious work, well worthy of notice, called "Triplicate Papers on Triunities," by A. F. Morgan. Elliot Stock.

Digitized by Google

his power to obey proved a power to disobey, and dependent as he was for divine life upon the tree of life, access to that tree becoming cut off, he ceased to live divinely, although his human life was continued some 900 years. Had he continued in obedience, his right to the tree of life would have been continued, for no inherent life, human or divine, had he; the smile of his Creator gave him access to that tree. "In his favour is life" (Ps. xxx. 5), therefore lost favour to him was lost life. But the Fall foreseen, a ransom had been found, because provided, and in Abel was found that faith which offered the more acceptable sacrifice than that of Cain, and although it cost him his life, he therein became the more perfect type of him who, as the woman's seed, should in after years bruise the serpent's head.

Now to the creatures of his power, animate and inanimate, the Creator's will became their limit, and hence we sing, "Praise ye him sun and moon, praise him all ye stars of light. Let them praise the name of the Lord, for he commanded and they were created. Praise the Lord from the earth, ye dragons and all deeps, beasts and all cattle, creeping things and flying fowl." As he made them for his praise, so they daily speak his praise. "All thy works shall *praise* thee, O Lord"—but saints do more—"thy saints *bless* thee." And here the purpose of God in the creation of man becomes manifested. Mute praise he has from all his works, but from man he wills to have *expressed* praise, pronounced *blessing*. From man's power to will and to do he seeks the worship service and song expressed in such words as those, "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me, bless and praise his holy name." Was it—we ask, suggestively—was it, that when in the upper council of eternity the question came forth, "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" one answered, "Lo, I come, in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God, thy law is within my heart;"—was it, we ask, that filial obedience became so well pleasing to the Father that he willed to create a race endowed with like capacity for obedience, out of which he might choose a bride for his well beloved Son? and hence we read, "According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love, to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Ephes. i. and iii.) Angels by transgression fell, now he would have a race of obedient ones, made in the likeness of his Son, who, schooled to obedience, should never fall; and that they might learn obedience through suffering, they came in contact with evil that they might prove overcomers. "There *must* be heresies that they which are approved may be made manifest." (1 Cor. xi. 19.) When? Where? At the judgment seat of Christ. At his appearing.

Digitized by Google

Now, then, we see the place and need for a judgment seat in the divine economy of a righteous God, and how it becomes written, "Why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; for it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." (Rom. xiv. 10, 12.) And again, "I know nothing *against* myself, yet am I not hereby justified, but he that judgeth me is the Lord, therefore judge nothing before the time until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts, and then shall every man —deserving it—have praise of God." (1 Cor. iv. 4, 5.) And again, "We labour, that whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him, (i.e., whether present in the body to be changed at his coming, or absent from the body, to be raised at his coming,) for we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (2 Cor. v. 9, 10.) In these portions of Scripture we see revealed an assize, a *pre-millennial* assize, which is altogether different and distinct from the post-millennial assize foreseen by John, Rev. xx. This pre-millennial assize it is which appears to us to have become altogether lost sight of in the current theology of our times, especially of our Protestant times, for the Romanist has an equivalent for it in his doctrine of purgatory in the separate state. The Protestant, in his zeal to avoid the doctrine of purgatory, has overlooked the judgment of works, and because our Lord's parable of the rich man and Lazarus and our Lord's words to the dying thief are both misunderstood, current theology has concluded that the believer at death steps from earth to heaven, and *so* the judgment seat of Christ is either ignored altogether, or left unexplained. But this cannot, must not, be, and the object of our present inquiry is to give it the weight and importance which Scripture ascribes to it, and to awaken ourselves and others to the gravity of its issues.

For now must go forth the proclamation in mid-air, where now the Judge is enthroned, "Gather my saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice, and the heavens shall declare his righteousness, for God is judge himself." (Ps. l. 5, 6.) And now we shall see that illustrious company seen by John, a sealed number symbolised as "an hundred and forty and four thousand, having the Father's name written in their foreheads; and they sang as it were a new song, and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand; these are they which were not defiled, for they are virgins, these are they that follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth, these were redeemed from among men, being the first fruits

Digitized by Google

unto God and the Lamb. And in their mouth was found no guile, for they are without fault before the throne of God." (Rev. xiv. 1-5.) These we take to be the same company recorded in the following chapter, as seen standing on the sea of glass, having the harps of God, and they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb. These are they that are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb. These are they that have given diligence to make their calling and election sure, and *so* an entrance shall be ministered unto them abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. These are they that henceforth are *with* him as the called, and chosen, and faithful. These are they to whom he will grant to sit with him on his throne, "for the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." (Rev. vii. 17.) Much dishonour we feel is done to the Bridegroom in the low estimate set by Christians generally upon the Bride, by including in her all believers, regardless of their state or attainments, as if no difference existed between the "*overcomers*," and those to whom it is said, "*I have somewhat against thee*." Yet what bridegroom worthy of the name would not feel it dishonouring to himself to have a bride upon whom any reflection could be cast by any one, as if some stranger could know her better than himself, and knew that she was unworthy of him. Such, if true, would be a reflection upon *his* choice; if false, would be a reflection upon *her*, which he would not fail to resent. Poor, frail humanity might so err, but the Omniscient one, never.

And when to her we shall hear him say, "Thou art *all* fair, my love, there is *no* spot in thee," we shall expect to see one fair indeed. The King's daughter is all glorious within and without, her very clothing is of wrought gold. Transparent in beauty, she is now found at his right hand as the Queen in gold of Ophir. John describes her, as seen by him in vision, "A city having the glory of God, and her light like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal, and the street was pure gold, as it were transparent glass." The language of mortality seems to fail him in describing the beauty that he saw in vision only. What then shall the reality be? And one prominent end—if not the chief—sought by these suggestions, is to *distinguish* the bride elect, and to raise our estimate of her character to the true scripture standard, which traditional teaching has done so much to lower.

We now come to consider the necessity of a personal recognition at the judgment seat, and whatever difficulty it may present to some minds, such must remember our Lord's words, which say "the things which are impossible with men *are* possible with God." The words, "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father;" and again, "We must all appear, that every one may receive according to that he hath

Digitized by Google

done;" and again, "So then every one must give account of himself to God;" and again, "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give to me at that day," all point to a *personal* recognition, a *personal* confession, and a *personal* rewarding. For now we must see the distribution of rewards, and the Lord, the righteous Judge, dividing to every man severally as he will. A white stone to each, and in the stone the new name written, probably denoting his title or dignity. A crown to each, but possibly having distinction according to the rule and authority given over five cities or ten. As one star differeth from another star in glory, so also shall these in their resurrection state. Then shall it be seen who has laid up treasure in the heavens that fadeth not, and *what it means*. Who by "using the office of a deacon—or any other—well, has purchased to himself a good degree, and great boldness in the faith." Here shall be seen those whose building having been gold, silver, and precious stones, their work abides the test of that presence, which as fire and as light shall manifest every man's work of what sort it is, and they receive a reward. Whatever mistakes we have made about our own, or another man's work, shall then and there be corrected; and the least service done to the Master's eye and for his glory, shall not lose its reward. Experiences many, strange and new, must there be had. Lessons many, both strange and new, must there be learned. Our estimate of good and ill, right and wrong, things pleasing and displeasing in his sight, so imperfect here, must be perfected there. Lessons in rule and jurisprudence, so imperfectly learned here, must be given and received there, to fit some for kings; and possibly, lessons in holy and reverent service, to fit others for priests: unless both orders shall be combined in one and the same character. We are deeply convinced that our fitness for rule and worship in the kingdom to come is not completed here as it must be before we enter upon it. Our sojourn here—at the longest, short, and with some, how short!—is at best but a preliminary stage to the eternity that lies before us. Experience much, and lessons many, here lost, must be there gained, ere we shall be thoroughly furnished for the service that then awaits us. How many now *last* shall then be *first!* How many a man shall be set before his master! How many a maid before her mistress! How many a curate before his rector! How many a vicar before his lord bishop!

In the bestowment of an individual crown, and the acknowledgment of individual work, we think, too, there must be some mention made of individual failure, failure of judgment rather than of principle; zeal for God it may have been, but not according to knowledge. In the light of that presence, right and wrong must take colour and shape according to *truth*, and when wrong is seen to be wrong, the very light that discovers it will reprove it. Right *must* be vindicated, and wrong *must* be reproved, though it shall

Digitized by Google

have been committed by the best of men. When he makes darkness light before us, every crooked thing shall be made straight, and every rough place plain. Sharp contentions between brethren, such as that between Paul and Barnabas respecting Mark, which have never been cleared up, must then be settled by the Master, and each made to bear his own blame if both were wrong. Then possibly we shall see whether Paul was altogether right in withstanding to the face Peter—chief apostle as he was—or whether it would not have been more in the Spirit of his Master to have taken Peter aside, privately, and told him his fault, and so gained his brother Peter:—whether such rough handling by Paul may not have left a soreness between the two eminent servants of the Church which was never quite healed:—whether Paul acted rightly in standing upon his Roman citizenship and appealing to Cæsar, notwithstanding it turned to account for testimony in Rome, and the writing of several epistles for the good of the Church to the end of time; for he not only failed to obtain judgment against his false accusers, but fell into the mouth of the lion, that devoured him eventually:—how far the contentions of Luther, first against the Pope, and then with his own fellow reformers, were conducted in his own spirit or his Master's:—what excesses he went into, first in serving, and then in damaging the cause of truth:—whether Zwingle, the Swiss Reformer, died on the battle field, sword in hand, at the early age of 47, by the will of God or by an error of judgment, his own or others, and whether years of usefulness were not by that means sacrificed:—whether the persecuting spirit in Calvin, as it fell upon Castalio, Jaques Gruet, and Michael Servetus, even unto death, will not claim attention and reproof in that day:—how far Cromwell, and the good men of his time—so divided as they were in their judgment concerning the king—were responsible for the regicide, or whether it was a necessity, a just visitation upon an unrighteous ruler, and no such crime as history has written it:—how far contentions for doctrine in the eighteenth century, carried on between the Calvinists and the Arminians, when debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, and tumults were not only tolerated, but cultivated in zealous defence of doctrinal truth, to the extent of biting, devouring, and consuming one another, will be countenanced or condemned by the Master, and who was most to blame:—how far Wm. Huntington, the *sinner saved*, was a saint sanctified, and whether his "*Skeleton, the Arminian Anatomised*," and other kindred works, were written in a zeal without knowledge, and earnestness without love, a higher truth sacrificed in defence of a lower:—how it could be that one so well acquainted with his Bible could so completely overlook 1 Cor. xiii. 4, 5:—how far Edward Irving was anointed for a special work, and did it well, and for it became cast out as evil, and died of a broken heart, who was to blame for it, and to what extent his errors were real or supposed:—

Digitized by Google

how far he and his Master will agree in recognising the work of the "Twelve Apostles Restored," and their Catholic Apostolic institution as human or divine:—how far another distinguished servant of Christ succeeded Edward Irving in testimony to the coming Bridegroom for some fifteen years, and then failed, although he lived on other thirty years in comparative silence and obscurity; *many* wait the decisions of that day for an *explanation* of all this:—how far the Brethren, popularly known as the Plymouth Brethren, started fairly, stood well a while, promised great things for the true Church of Christ in their coming out of the Babylon of sectarianism in obedience to the Spirit's guidance as a witness much needed for the time—(by the way, since we spoke of this section of the Church in one of our earliest pages, we have learned that our esteemed brother, Benjamin Wills Newton, has not been connected with Brethren of late years, but has been rather ignored by them, as giving countenance to the one-man-ministry, by ministering statedly himself to a gathering of believers who value his teaching):—who has been to blame for these divisions, and why the question should be asked by some, Whether J. N. Darby has wrought most good or most harm in the Church of Christ the last forty years? we shall then and there learn from the Master's own lips:—whether the Council of Eight of recent times, in dealing with a supposed erring brother, performed the wise and loving part of brethren in healing a cruel wound, or helped to further crush one already crushed:—whether the error in judgment *was* most his or theirs shall then appear:—how far the spirit of the New Testament has been best understood, confessed, and obeyed by those who have multiplied forms and ceremonies, pleaded apostolic succession, and the power of a priesthood to consecrate persons, places, and things, or by the Society of Friends, which, since the days of George Fox, of blessed memory, has borne earnest, consistent, and persevering testimony against all such:—and lastly, how far *our own* work, including even the writing of *these suggestions*, shall have been the fruit of our own fancy, or the result of a divine teaching. Failure will doubtless be found upon us all, more or less. How those failures will be regarded and dealt with—as it seems to us imperative they should be dealt with—ere he can present unto himself the Church glorious, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, is the question raised by these suggestions.

But when all are crowned and rewarded according to their work, and in one bright company sit down with him in his throne, he having crowned them, they shall cast all their crowns at *his* feet, confessing, "Thou, O God, hast wrought all our works in us; we are unprofitable servants, for we have only done what we were bound to do." "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."

Digitized by Google

But sterner work awaits, and must be considered. For the light of the same presence which has tested and approved the work of some, must test and disprove the work of others. Wood, hay, and stubble are mentioned among the building materials, and these are all combustible. What then do we read? "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

Hackney. N. STARKEY.

*(To be continued.)*

---

# THE JUSTICE AND LOVE OF GOD.

## A COLLOQUY.

IF, on the one hand, there be a tidal wave of Materialism and Scepticism, upheaved by the forces of science and rationalism, which is threatening serious injury to the "high and dry" school of religious orthodoxy; there is, on the other hand, a fresh and invigorating breeze of Bible truth sweeping across Christendom, revivifying its languid powers, and, at the same time, intensifying and glorifying its religious life. I refer to the larger spirit in which biblical criticism is conducted, and more particularly in the worthier conceptions of God's nature and character which are obtaining such prominence in the teaching of the pulpit and the press, and in the tone of religious society generally. The harsher doctrines of Calvinism are wearing away: even in Scotland —its stronghold—notwithstanding the fact that the public teachers and elders of the three great Presbyterian bodies are pledged to maintain the antiquated and in some respects cruel doctrines of the Westminster Confession of Faith,—the recent heresy cases, and notably that of the Fergus Ferguson, in the United Presbyterian denomination, have elicited an expression of feeling for a more generous interpretation both of the letter and the spirit of Scripture, amounting in some instances to a desire to shake off lengthy and carefully detailed creeds, and to have larger freedom of appeal to the high standard of the sacred oracles. Any one who has read the speeches made in the recent annual assemblies of the Scotch Churches must have noticed the kindlier spirit of toleration manifested, as compared with former days. Doctrines at one time regarded as beyond all controversy, have been severely scrutinised and criticised; and not a few ecclesiastics have, if I mistake not, learned the salutary lesson that the same doctrine which they hold in a gross, material, I had almost said, vulgar form, is capable of a more refined and spiritual definition corresponding to the more exalted and delicate perception of the brother whom they suspect of heresy. I hail these indications of broadening sympathies as proofs that the leaven of Christian charity is working in our midst,—that "Charity which suffereth long and is kind; believeth all things, and hopeth all things." Not till we recognise more fully the love of God is it likely that our love will be God-like; and perhaps theologians, with their ponderous "Systems," who surely of all men ought to have revealed the true

Digitized by Google

character of God the Father, are not a little blamable for the distorted views that have gained acceptance regarding him and his love. Nor can I help thinking that the antagonistic and unsympathetic connection between divine justice and love which implicitly and explicitly has been thought to exist in the divine mind and nature, has done much to hide the glory of God's name,—which is LOVE; and for this reason I will briefly attempt to establish the harmony between the *justice and love of God.* The readers of the RAINBOW will not object if the argument be stated in a colloquial form; it is somewhat unusual, but, for the writer's purpose, convenient.

THE COLLOQUY.

A.—"From the remarks you have just made, I fear there must exist in your mind what seems to me a dangerous tendency; for, if I understand you aright, your argument would almost obliterate the distinction between justice and love."

B.—"Then do things differ essentially when they perfectly harmonise?"

A.—"Well, I will save myself the necessity of answering that by affirming that justice and love *do not harmonise;* they are distinct and opposed functions."

B.—"'Functions' did you say? Justice may be a function, but not love. I suspect you are disposed to look upon the Divine love as you would upon the Divine power,—not as a natural, inevitable outcome of God's very nature, but as a something which he *wills* to exert when he pleases."

A.—"No, not exactly. I admit that it is his 'nature and property' to love, but I believe that he withholds or exercises that love when he sees fit."

B.—"Just so; a kind of prudence prompts *when* to love, you mean?"

A.—"Well, there is something that rules and regulates his love, and prevents its being indiscriminate."

B.—"Surely! it were otherwise blind; but what then is this regulating power?"

A.—"On the Divine side, his own free sovereign will, for in all things, even in his love, 'He doth according to his will.' On the human side—man's sin acting upon God's will."

B.—"The latter, in certain respects, I admit; the former, as an ultimate cause, I cannot; for God's will is subject, if I may reverently say so, to his very nature. You could not, for instance, imagine that God would *will* to do a wrong thing."

A.—"Certainly not."

B.—"But why, if the will is *absolutely free?*"

A.—"Because he is a perfectly holy God."

B.—"But why then?"

A.—"Simply because he cannot contradict himself—his own nature."

B.—"Quite so; his nature is greater, or rather above, his will; and by a parity of reasoning, if God cannot will a wrong act because it contradicts his holy nature, neither can he will *to love,* unless in harmony with his loving nature; or, if I may more forcibly phrase it, his *nature of love.*"

Digitized by Google

A.—"Ah! then you do trace his love up to his will, after all?"

B.—"So far, yes; for will is but a link between the act and that motive-power which precedes the will."

A.—"You're getting metaphysical."

B.—"I can't help myself; but never mind that, so long as we understand each other, and get nearer the truth."

A.—"Well, well. You trace love up to will; we are at one here, where is the vital difference?"

B.—"In this: that you place the Divine love solely under the control of will, and give it but a precarious basis to rest upon; whereas I would carry it beyond that, and plant it in the very heart of his being, which is must not only 'not contradict,' but must positively *obey*."

A.—"You seem to assume—Oh, the depth and subtilty of your heresy!—that God's glorious attribute of love is a *necessary* out-growth of his nature, or some part of his nature, and that therefore—so I infer—*God cannot help loving:* his will is powerless: he is under fatalism to himself. You first destroy his freedom of will, and by the act the freedom of his love."

B.—"Not so fast with your inferences, good friend; try a kinder word for my heresy. I am but attempting to get things into their proper place and order, that we may have a truer understanding; and so far from aiming at destroying the freedom of God's will I am doing all I can to bind them closer together. Righteous freedom of will does not consist in arbitrary, isolated volitions; it is affected by antecedent influences operating upon the will, which influences it may be said to register and carry on a stage further towards their ultimate aim."

A.—"I see the drift of your arguments, and upon reflection I may be able to endorse them; but in the meantime, I am less suspicious of your orthodoxy."

B.—"Well said. I am hopeful of you now."

A.—"Don't reckon without your host. What has all this discussion to do with the harmony between justice and love? I am as far as ever from seeing them to be other than diametrically opposite qualities, and in essential conflict with each other."

B.—"In one sense they may be opposite and in conflict, though their ultimate tendency is toward the same object. Two streams may be from the same fountain-head, though the course of their currents may tend in opposite directions; their waters may ever meet in conflict, but yet both will *ultimately* flow into the same sea."

A.—"Then in the meantime they have no harmony with each other?"

B.—"Not if you separate them from their origin and end. If you attempt to separate God's justice and love from himself, you must take the consequence in mental confusion."

A.—"You speak of God's attributes as though they were distinct from—though I admit closely linked with—himself. Now I maintain that no conception of God is legitimate that would break up his unity."

B.—"You are unconsciously turning round to my way of thinking, for you began by objecting to the harmony between justice and love, by making them, as it were, independent attributes proceeding in opposite directions, and accomplishing opposite results. You now take me

Digitized by Google

to task for attempting to dislocate them from God's unity. The charge, however, rebounds upon yourself, for this unity of the divine nature is the very thing I am contending for."

A.—"Perhaps I did not clearly express myself just now. This is what I really mean—You spoke about 'separating God's justice and his love from himself;' now to my mind justice and love are but parts of himself, and, along with his other attributes, make up his unity. Your abstract conception of God seems to be a Deity who *possesses* justice and love which, though necessarily *associated* with himself, are not part of himself—his essence."

B.—"You are both misapprehending me, and, at the same time, travelling farther than ever from your original position. Let me fully and unmistakably admit that I believe God would not be God if he could part with one of his attributes; but still, I hold it to be correct and scriptural to think of the Divine Being, apart from his attributes, in the same way that you may conceive of *me* apart from memory or will. And more than that; these faculties of mine, though the same in kind belong to the brute creation, will be exercised in harmony with my higher nature. In the same sense I am entitled to expect a harmony of God's justice and love with himself."

A.—"To make the analogy at least more verbally correct, ought you not to substitute 'his divine nature' for 'Himself'?"

B.—"Well, well; the sense is synonymous, for his *nature* is *himself*."

A.—"Then, allowing you these distinctions between his necessary attributes and himself, the question comes to be this—'What is God's nature, or rather the nature of his nature—excuse the phraseology—into harmony with which you would bring all his attributes?' This is the vital point, I should say."

B.—"True; everything depends upon this, and my answer is that of St. John, 'God is Love.' This is the divine centre, so to speak, around which all his attributes move—the sun which illuminates them all, and from which flashes the white light of his holiness. And, because God is love, we read that he is also 'light,' and therefore *just*. The harmony then which I claim for justice and love, is the harmony of God with himself, i.e., self-consistency."

A.—"But have you not all along spoken of love as an *attribute* of God? Is it consistent, then, at one time to speak of it thus, and at another to say love is but God himself?"

B.—"Allow me in turn to correct you—not 'love is God,' but 'God is love;' and my reply is that, for convenience' sake I speak of love as an attribute, but perhaps it is theologically a blunder so to name it."

A.—"After all, I can't quite see—granting your position—a very intimate harmony between justice and love. For instance, take an act of punishment causing pain, and perhaps administered in wrath; does it not require microscopical examination to find love there?"

B.—"Does it? then pause before you lift a hand against any of your children in future; and perhaps the next time we meet, we will look into the harmony between the divine punishments and the divine love. Depend upon it, they *must* harmonise. God cannot contradict or deny himself; and I trust we shall find that as God's 'tender mercies are



Digitized by Google

over all his works,' so is his love over all his attributes. Give me the last word before parting, please. 'Love is the fulfilling of the law;' justice is but part of the law which love fulfils; love, therefore, originates justice. 'He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God,' There are two texts for you; if you don't mind a third, take this, 'Who slew Og, king of Bashan, *for* his *mercy* endureth for ever.'"

* JAMES DOBSON.

---

# THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

## AN EXPLANATION.

READERS of the RAINBOW cannot fail to have been deeply interested in the recent attempts of Messieurs Maude and Rotherham to rescue from the charge of carrying an insipid truism the text which our Authorised Version presents in the following form:—"If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked." (2 Cor. v. 3.)

Pursuing with intense eagerness Mr. Rotherham's analysis of his brother's essay on the Resurrection till he reached the difficult text in question, I felt for a moment that the guide, though eminently trustworthy, had escaped my limited ken. Will the reader courteously go back to the paper which appeared in the August number, in order thoroughly to apprehend Mr. Rotherham's translation of the verse and the inference derivable. I would add; that, failing to see how the Apostle could avoid disrobing, unless he lived till the second coming, I was still in the dark as to the sort of contingency from which he shrank. Granted, that the definition between "clothing" and "over-clothing" pointed to two conditions differing as objects of desire, to what did the inferior condition point if not to a disrobing? And why inferior or less desirable at all? I cannot recall the wording of my queries, but I believe one of them took this form. "Do you mean that 'It is as if the Apostle had said, The main thing I grant is that we be found at last in our heavenly vesture. Nevertheless, we would fain be spared the disrobing altogether,' but alas! we cannot be spared it."

Our friend's further elucidation of the subject here following cannot but interest us all. If my darkness bring out more light, I am well content.

JAMES WAYLEN.

"TO PUT ON" and "to put on over" may be used either synonymously or distinctively. They are used distinctively when the former is applied to the enrobing of an otherwise naked person and the latter is applied to the putting on of one vesture over another. In the case of the Lord's people at his coming, some (*a*) will put on their heavenly vesture over their earthly—without disrobing, without dying: left over among the living till that auspicious moment, they will be instantly transformed. Others (*b*) having been "naked" for a time, will be simply clothed; having on no garment, they will merely "put on" the all-sufficient heavenly vesture: they will indeed have *been* naked (from death to the resurrection), but they will nevertheless not be "found naked" at the time of advancing the guests to their seats in the festal chamber, of

Digitized by Google

marshalling the forces, of ushering in the kingdom, and installing into office therein;—in other words, will not be found naked when so to be found would involve shame and disadvantage.

The apostle Paul, in the fervour of his love, the vividness of his ideality, and the limitation of his knowledge, hoped to have place in class (*a*); *but conceded* that should he be allotted to class (*b*), the grand future would lie open to him all the same.

Of the mere *state* of being naked he says nothing: the *act* of disrobing had for him no charm: the possible *fact* of being found naked when he ought to have been robed and ready filled him with godly fear.

Certainly then I do *not* understand the Apostle as if he had said: "Alas! we cannot be spared the disrobing altogether for a time:" on the contrary, his words seem to me to say: "We *hope* to be altogether* spared the disrobing."

I say nothing of "total disrobing;" for, please observe that the Apostle says nothing of either "total disrobing" or "partial disrobing." To disrobe or not to disrobe, that is the question. Class (*a*) will not disrobe, class (*b*) will: there is no third class.

The act of simply "clothing," peculiar to class (*b*) obviously falls short of the more triumphant act of "over-clothing" peculiar to class (*a*).

And so, finally, it is evident that the two acts are different, just as transformation and resurrection are different, and no otherwise; but instead of being the one antecedent to the other, they are expressly declared to be simultaneous: at one and the same moment, class (*a*) will "put on" their heavenly vesture "over" their earthly, and class (*b*) "put on" their heavenly vesture, so as thus, in due time, to have arrayed their previously stripped "inner man."

It remains but to add that although the two Greek words underlying the two renderings, "put on," and "put on over" might conceivably in some circumstances be used synonymously, yet it is much more likely that in a passage like this, the difference of form represents a difference in significance; and the moment it is perceived that the distinctive use of the two forms imparts to the whole passage a discrimination, a perspicuity, and a fulness which the synonymous use fails to give, that moment the likelihood becomes a moral certainty in the mind of the impartial reader.

JOSEPH B. ROTHERHAM.

---

## PSALM CIX.

I HAVE no wish needlessly to protract discussion, but trust I may be allowed to make a few remarks in reply to Mr. Deacon's criticism of my exposition of this psalm, which appeared in the January RAINBOW. It would be idle for me to follow him anew over the whole field of inquiry as to which view of the psalm—his or mine—is the more harmonious or

* Since writing the above, it has dawned upon me that it is this one word, "altogether," which has obscured my meaning, and caused Mr. Waylen to stumble. Will the reader then please consider the word withdrawn from p. 359, third line of text from the bottom? *Our hope, at its brightest, is, to be spared disrobing; and thus do we prefer to cherish it. Nevertheless should we have to disrobe, all will be well: we shall be again enrobed in due time for the one simultaneous entrance into our Master's joy.*—J. B. R.



Digitized by Google

satisfactory. I may be allowed to repeat, however, that the main evidence that the curses of verses 6-19 proceeded from the psalmist's enemies in the first instance, seems to me to be found in the harmonious and connected view which such a supposition produces, of the literary structure* of the psalm and the mental attitude of the psalmist. I only referred to Dr. Clarke's and Mr. Hammond's renderings of verse 20 as "a remarkable *corroboration* of the theory which had been found to fit so aptly to the rest of the psalm" (p. 22). It is not essential to my understanding of the real source of these imprecations that I should abandon the authorised translation of that verse;—"This (shall be) the *reward* of mine adversaries from the Lord, and of them that speak evil against my soul." Letting this stand, it amounts to a simple prediction by the psalmist that the evils which his foes sought to obtain for him, which he has just enumerated at length, should recoil upon their own heads.

Even although Mr. Deacon, therefore, should have proved the altered reading untenable, he has not thereby touched the foundation of my general theory. I may take leave to say, however, that I do not think he has been very successful in his attempts to upset the force in favour of the new reading of the *primary* meaning of פעלה as given by Gesenius, and as rendered by the LXX and Vulgate, viz.: *work, labour;* ἔργον, *opus.* He thinks these last two words may, to the readers of the versions referred to, have conveyed the secondary meaning of *reward,* because they sometimes mean *punishment inflicted.* This is a question for scholars to decide; but I would respectfully suggest (subject to correction by more competent linguists), that before these versions could convey such an idea, the terms ἔργον and *opus* would require to mean "punishment received." For, observe, it is not said, "*opus Domini,*" or ἔργον τον κυριου, but "*opus eorum*" — εργον των διαβαλλοντων. Can it be shown that these two terms are ever used with the genitive of any other than the *agent?* Can "opus *eorum,*" for example, legitimately mean "a work done by some other one *upon them?*" If not, I take it that the versions understood the Hebrew word in its primary sense, meaning, a *work* of which the psalmist's foes were the *doers;* and had they thought the secondary meaning the right one, viz., "a reward *received,*" they would have used some other term in Greek and Latin to correspond. This whole point is, however, as I have said, merely a side issue.

A more essential objection is raised on p. 168 to my exposition of the psalm. Mr. Deacon says that the words contained in verses 6-19 "cannot possibly be understood, by any unprejudiced reader, as proceeding from any other than the writer of the psalm." Now, I question if it adds anything to the strength of any man's position to claim for himself a monopoly of freedom from prejudice. But let that pass. He asserts that these verses contain sentiments which render it "inconceivable" that they "are the quoted utterances of a persecuting enemy of David." Let us see.

* Mr. Deacon objects to have any puzzling questions as to change of pronouns solved, however satisfactorily, in Psa. cix. unless we can do the same in Psa. xxxv. and xli. Or, rather, he thinks that to adduce two other puzzles solves the first!

Digitized by Google

1. He thinks no "wicked man" can be conceived as uttering "an address, if not a prayer, to the Divine being." Is he sure of that? Do not the worst forms of blasphemy which fill our thoroughfares take the form of appeals to the Divine being? Has not many a form of persecuting zeal invoked the divine aid on its evil projects? But another word anon on this head.

2. "Not only does the speaker believe in God," says my critic, "but also in Satan, and has a clear perception that a 'wicked man' invested with power is a curse in the earth."

As to belief in God (i.e. in his existence, which I presume is intended), I fail to see any weight in that. Many a man is "wicked" without being an Atheist. And even the chief cupbearer of Sennacherib could say in his cruel boasting against the good King Hezekiah—with how much of truth the event showed—"Am I now come up *without the Lord* against this place to destroy it? The Lord said to me, Go up against this land to destroy it." (2 Kings xviii. 25.) As for the remainder of the above objection, it is, I presume, based on verse 6: "Set thou a wicked man over him, and let Satan (margin, "an adversary") stand at his right hand." I would call Mr. Deacon's attention to the explanation of these words, given by a commentator who seems to have much weight with him. Dr. Perowne explains: '*Set*,' i.e. in an official capacity; . . . appoint as judge, or set over him with power and authority to punish." Again, in the second clause, "let him not only have an *unrighteous judge*, but a *malicious accuser*." Does Mr. Deacon still think this a desire which it is "inconceivable" a persecuting enemy of the king might utter?

3. "The speaker," Mr. Deacon continues, "hails the existence of judgment and condemnation for the unmerciful; he acknowledges the great realities of prayer and sin; he believes in iniquity, and that the Lord—the Lord alone—can blot it out, even as he can remember it."

On this I would remark, generally, that certain types of wicked men may have clear enough perceptions of certain moral truths, *considered in the abstract*, and yet may fail entirely in their application to particular instances. But my answer to this head is not the discussion of probabilities. I need not spend time theorising when facts may be adduced. Mr. Deacon thinks it is "inconceivable" that any "persecuting enemy of David" ever could assume such a position as he has above described. Let us turn then to the recorded curses of Shimei, and see if some of the very points he deems it inconceivable could appear were not actually exemplified in this case. (2 Sam. xvi. 7, 8.) "And thus said Shimei when he cursed, Come out, come out, thou bloody man, and thou man of Belial: *the Lord* hath *returned upon thee* all the blood of the house of Saul, in whose stead thou hast reigned; and *the Lord* hath delivered the kingdom into the hand of Absalom thy son; and behold, *thou art taken in thy mischief, because thou art a bloody man*." Have we not here a "wicked man" (Mr. Deacon may remember he himself described him formerly as an "old sinner") "hailing the existence of judgment and condemnation for the unmerciful; . believing in iniquity, and that the Lord—the Lord alone—can blot it out, as he can remember it?"

With regard to "acknowledgment of the great reality of *prayer*," I venture to think Mr. Deacon has overlooked that this point, if pressed,

Digitized by Google

becomes fatal to his own position. For observe, if the psalmist is, as Mr. Deacon contends, truly describing in these verses the character of his adversary, it is clear that that adversary was a man of whom the psalmist could say: "let *his prayer* become sin." Not only does Mr. Deacon's objection on this point answer itself as to the "*acknowledgment*" of such a reality as prayer; but it also answers the very groundwork of his whole objection, viz., that the words from verses 6 to 19 are "an address, if not a prayer, to the Divine being," and must therefore be the psalmist's own. The psalmist's adversary, according to Mr. Deacon's theory, is a man who, in the psalmist's opinion, is likely even to *engage* in prayer! Surely I might with justice retaliate Mr. Deacon's question —"What kind of wicked man this can be" who is given to prayer?

4. I think I am entitled to consider Mr. Deacon's objection, in the light of the points just referred to, as quite powerless to overthrow my reading of the psalm. Yet I may add a word on the remainder of his indictment. The speaker's "zeal," he says, "is against one who remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even slay the broken in heart," &c. Therefore, he argues, the imprecator must be a man of God. But after what we have already seen as to Shimei's curses, I fail to see any such necessity in the case. It is (to me at least) conceivable that the accusations herein set forth were either wholly or in great measure unfounded; and let me further add that such a supposition harmonises perfectly with the theory I am maintaining as to the authorship of these imprecations. The pith of the psalmist's complaint was, not alone that the words of his enemies were "words of hatred," but that their accusations were *false*:—"They have spoken against me with *a lying tongue*" (ver. 2); "they fought against me *without a cause*" (ver. 3). This point, then, if it does not support, at least does not invalidate my theory.

Before quitting this head, let me call attention to a touching coincidence with the general view of the psalm which I have advocated—viz., that it is the utterance of an innocent and maligned man of faith laying the words of his enemies before God—to be found in the concluding burst of confident thanksgiving (vers. 30, 31) when compared with the opening of the adversaries' words (ver. 6). They had desired that he should have a wicked man (an "unjust judge" according to Perowne) set over him, and that a malicious accuser *should stand at his right hand*. But the psalmist's confidence is that notwithstanding their machinations, he should have at his right hand a very different presence. "I will greatly praise THE LORD with my mouth; . . for *he* shall stand *at the right hand* of the poor, to save him from those that condemn his soul." This is but one of many points of confirmation of the general theory which the reader may find mentioned in Mr. Hammond's article in the *Expositor*.

Let me add a word as to Acts i. 16-20. Mr. Deacon uses some very strong declamation against the idea which I formerly threw out that Peter was only quoting from verse 8 by way of "free adaptation" to Judas' case. I have formerly pointed out what seemed to me complete contradictions in Mr. Deacon's own utterances as to the inspiration of this psalm, considered as a prediction of judgment on Christ's enemies, of whom Judas was one. I question, therefore, his right to claim for his

Digitized by Google

view (whatever it may be) exclusive possession of all the virtues of a "higher criticism;" until at least he has shown us, by something more than mere assertion, that "there is no inconsistency" in his former statements on the matter. I hope, however, no reader will be prevented by his denunciations from looking fairly at what I advanced upon this head. It is a very serious matter to upset the natural and harmonious meaning of the psalm under consideration, unless it can be shown that the quotation made by the apostle from verse 8 *absolutely necessitates* it. Mr. Deacon labours hard to prove that "the scripture" of Acts i. 16 is the same as is quoted in ver. 20; that is, that Peter *intended* the one to refer to the other. Well, let Mr. Deacon have his way as to the connection of the two verses, and how much clearer is the question? As Mr. Hammond has said: "Suppose we admit that this scripture was prophetic of Judas, does that decide one way or the other as to the authorship of that part of the psalm? It merely amounts to this, that, by whomsoever uttered, it *foreshadowed* something relating to Judas Iscariot, and that it was fulfilled in him. But might not that something be foreshadowed, and in due course be fulfilled, though the words were originally spoken, not by David, but by David's enemy"?—more especially if, as is possible and already suggested, verse 20 of the psalm be a prediction that the words of that enemy would recoil upon his own head.

For my own part, whether there be, or be not, a logical connection between verses 16 and 20 of Acts i., I feel shut up, by the simple facts of the case, to the conclusion that Peter was quoting from the book of psalms in a flexible manner. It is clearly so when he *alters* the first half of his quotation to make it apply to Judas. This fact makes me pause ere building on the second half, any theory as to the application of the words *in their original context*, more especially if such theory seems to interfere with the harmonious understanding of the older scripture.

I have not written in defence of any particular theory of inspiration, nor as an advocate of any *doxy*. My plea is this: that, in our attempts to arrive at the spirit of the utterances of the older dispensation, especially as shown in what are called the imprecatory psalms, we must leave out of account Psalm cix, hitherto reckoned "the most fearful of them all," because it is a mistake to suppose its imprecations to proceed from the Psalmist's own mind. M. W. STRANG.

---

## "I WHISPER."

ONE of the pastors of the North Dutch Church, who had been absent from the city a few days, on returning stated the following, as a proof that the revival reaches the humblest in life and lifts them up to be fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of faith.

A man of very humble life appeared before the officers of a Church for examination with a view to admission. His examination was uncommonly satisfactory, and every one felt that this man was taught of God.

Digitized by Google

Something was said about prayer, and he was asked if he loved to pray.

He said he never prayed.

"You do not pray?" inquired one.

"No, sir."

"Do you not pray in your family?"

"No, sir."

"Do you not pray in secret?"

"No, sir."

These men, officers of the church, were greatly surprised. They felt that they had abundant evidence that he was a Christian, and yet he persisted in saying that he *never prayed.*

So one of them told him that he was very sorry, but they could not receive him into the Church if he did not pray.

The poor man seemed deeply grieved, and one of the officers perceiving it, said, "What do you do?"

"Why," said the man, "I whisper."

Here was a man who thought that nothing but audible prayer was prayer, so ignorant that he mistook the meaning of the word prayer, yet he was most unquestionably a man of humble, earnest prayer. This accidental discovery relieved the case of all embarrassment, and the man was cordially received and accepted as a true follower of the Lord Jesus. *New York Observer.*

Unconscious that the worship of the heart
Was highest, holiest prayer, the lowly lisper,
Timid in presence of more cultured men,
Said, "No, sir, I do not pray; I whisper."

Well said, my brother! "Whisper"—that's the word!
On lightning-wing it flieth to the Lord;
And though no voice disturbed the silent air,
It went to heaven direct as earnest prayer.

Swift as a thought before the throne of God
It rose accepted through Messiah's blood;
And on the humble seeker's soul there came
Rich showers of blessing in Messiah's name.

"I have no eloquence of speech," he feels,
"My only worship up in silence steals;
I cannot call it prayer; I do not pray!"
Yet fear not, saint, God will not say thee Nay.

The grandest liturgies, that ever rolled
Through Europe's great cathedrals, have but told
Of affluence in language; in the fire
That kindles pure devotion they expire.

All language is but clothing to the thought;
The wish of the petitioner has brought
The wished-for grace from heaven, though speech declined
To clothe the heart's desire in words refined.

Then whisper still, my friend; thy God will hear
Unuttered thoughts directed to his ear;
And feel assured that he who bought thee says
Of thee, the whispering one, "Behold, he *prays!*"

W. L.

Digitized by Google

# CORRESPONDENCE.

## ARE THE ANGLO-SAXONS ISRAELITES?

DEAR SIR,—In your last month's issue an article appeared by "P. W." in which the writer claims to have settled—evidently to his own satisfaction—the above important question. I humbly trust that I may be able to point out to "P. W." that "these experts" and, "theorists" have more *truth* on their side than he is prepared to call in question; and that even readers of the RAINBOW may venture to study this theory without running the risk of "perverting or nullifying the teaching of Holy Writ." If "P. W." had first made himself thoroughly acquainted with the literature belonging to this "fascinating and fashionable theory," I am convinced that he would never have set himself the task of combating hypothetical positions which have never entered the heads of any qualified expounder of the proposition under consideration.

For instance, in what department of the pernicious literature has "P. W." ever seen it advanced that "*all* the Anglo-Saxons—even if Israel—would ever be located in the land of Palestine?" or that "Israel means anything but the literal descendants of Jacob," or that "Jerusalem means anything but the "City of the Great King?" or worse, than all, that our blessed Lord's second advent means anything but his actual, personal coming—in like manner as he went away. I have been a constant subscriber to the RAINBOW for many years, and I have also read a considerable number of works on Anglo-Israelism—but I have not discovered yet that between the two schools of thought, there is any direct antagonism.

"P. W." may not be aware that many of our best living scholars advocate and expound the identity of the British nation with Israel. That this teaching "ministers to national vanity and arrogance" is a pure assumption; but that it is truly fascinating and full of the most glorious prospects for our nation, I am sure no candid student of the theory—who has looked at the matter in all its bearings—will deny. If the Anglo-Saxon race is identical with the house of Israel, then of course they inherit all the promises made to Israel. And what are these? Surely nothing less than that they shall be "*heirs of the world*," a "special people above all people," "above all nations;" as "multitudinous as the sand upon the seashore;" and not merely "a great nation," but a "company of nations." The great Jehovah calls himself their "King," their "Father," their "Husband," and they are "his elect," his "crown of glory" and he will be glorified in the eyes of the Gentile nations by their salvation.

But "P. W." is unable to distinguish between the "All Israel" of the house of "Joseph, the stick of Ephraim," and the house of Judah; and speaks very loosely about depriving "Israel of their birthright." There is not sufficient space here to enter into details, but a very short study of the writings of the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, and Zechariah, would soon assure any inquiring mind that there is a striking distinction between the prophecies relating to the two houses. While a reference to 1 Chron. v. 1, 2,

Digitized by Google

will settle at once to which house the birthright of the "many nations," or "company of nations" descended. To Judah remained the birthright of the Messiah, but through Joseph to Ephraim came the temporal birthright;—"the blessings of heaven above, and of *the deep* that lieth under." The seed of Ephraim should increase,—as fishes do increase,—into a multitude in the midst of the earth. Dare any one say that this decree has been altered? Some may think that Ephraim's seed forfeited their birthright on account of their idolatry. But the prophecy was uttered unconditionally. And in order to dispel any doubt upon the matter, let us search the Scripture records for further corroboration. In 1 Kings xii. we find that the temporal sovereignty or "*kingdom*" was rent from Judah, and given to "All Israel," of which the house of Ephraim was the leading tribe. But what of their exile? are they not now utterly cast away? Read Hosea ii. 23: "I will say to them which were not my people, thou art my people:" and they shall say, "Thou art my God." The context shows very clearly that God's exiled people are addressed. In the same chapter ver. 14, God's says: he "will allure Israel in the wilderness, and speak comfortably unto her," and in ver. 23: "I will sow her unto me in the earth." This surely means nothing less than a conversion of Israel,—even before her restoration,—and then their employment *as missionaries*. Zech x. 9, also reiterates this promise, but limits it to "they of Ephraim." "I will sow them among the people, they shall *remember me* in far countries, and they shall live with their children, and *turn again*." Their blessings of increase also return *before their restoration*. Read Zech. x. 8: "They shall increase as they have increased," and Jer. xxxi. 6: when the watchmen of Ephraim, whom the Lord hath "loved with an everlasting love," are bidden to prepare to "go up to Zion" the prophet says, "Thus saith the Lord, Sing with gladness for Jacob, and shout among the *chief of the nations*."

And now lastly, where is this great, colonising, and Christian power, this chief of nations, to be found? Read Jer. xxxi. 8: "I will gather them from the *north country* and from the coasts (or sides) of the earth." Where should God's people renew their strength but "in the islands?" (Isaiah xli. 1,) and they should "glorify the name of the Lord in *the isles of the sea*." (Isaiah xxiv. 15.) In another passage of Scripture Ephraim is also said to be found in the west. Hosea xi. 9 and 11: "They shall walk after the Lord,—the children shall tremble *from the west*,—and I shall place them in their houses!"

Space forbids my carrying the subject further. If I have succeeded in directing the attention of RAINBOW readers to this very important and interesting question, I shall have abundant satisfaction and pleasure: while at the same time I sincerely trust that "P. W." and others who have ridiculed the whole matter, and even despised the advocates of the Anglo-Israelite theory—will be induced to study the question more thoroughly and seriously,—comparing Scripture with Scripture.

I am fully aware that I have not succeeded in placing the matter beyond all dispute: but I hope that I have shown that it is highly probable that our own most favoured nation—which enjoys *without fail every blessing* that was promised to Israel before their restoration to

Digitized by Google

the Promised Land—is identical with lost Israel especially when historical and ethnological considerations are strongly in favour of such a deduction.

Yours sincerely,
Hartlepool. C. Lugg.

---

## THE IMMORTALITY QUESTION IN SCOTLAND.

Dear Sir,—You will be glad to learn that ground has been at length broken in Scotland on the question of Immortality, and that under such circumstances as to induce the hope that the subject will be opened up in all its bearings. I do not refer to the cases of Messrs. David Macrae and Fergus Ferguson, ministers of the United Presbyterian Church who have had the question of future punishment raised among other matters at the church courts; though something favourable to progress is to be found even in this. I refer to the fact that at the Spring Conference of the Evangelical Union, held at Dundee in April, a paper on "The Future State, and the Theory of Annihilation," was read and discussed, the outcome of which plainly is that perfect toleration on the question of Future Punishment, shall henceforth be the rule in that body of professed disciples of Christ. Some thirty years ago, William Glen Moncrieff was refused admission to the Union because he believed that the penalty of sin is literal death.

The paper was read by Mr. John Morton, of Dalkeith, and both it and the remarks which followed, showed that the "larger hope" is the more favoured view at present. The annihilation theory came in for a considerable share of adverse criticism, though of rather a general character; while the doctrine of eternal suffering was treated as fast becoming obsolete. Mr. Morton said, "Some may say, 'Let this subject alone; God will do all things well.' We cannot obey. This is the very reason why we should examine it. The answer which has long been popular is at length passing into the cold shade of neglect—that is, the impenitent at death are consigned to the place of punishment, where they remain impenitent, and suffer even increasing pain for ever, . . . endless sinners — ceaseless sufferers. From Origen down to Canon Farrar and Samuel Cox, there has always been a revolt against this stern, clear-cut conception of endless impenitence and pain. Canon Farrar's eloquent sentences—sweeping on like Atlantic waves—which recently woke the echoes of Westminster Abbey, and which did not fail to resound in the vaster temple of the Christian heart—are but part of a mightier movement in the spirit of the time. In the preface to *Salvator Mundi*, Samuel Cox says: 'The mission of this book is to encourage those who faintly trust the larger hope, to commit themselves wholly and fearlessly, by showing them that they have ample warrant for it in the Scriptures of the New Testament.' And to embolden those of us who timidly ask if any of the fathers have received the fuller faith, he adds: 'Few of the more thoughtful and cultivated preachers of the Gospel now hold the dogma of everlasting torments. In a large circle of acquaintances I hardly know one.'"

Mr. Morton refers at some length to the theory of annihilation under two of its many phases, namely, that alleged to be advocated by Mr. Edward White, and that which makes the first death extinction of

Digitized by Google

conscious being, requiring a resurrection to qualify for judgment, in order to be rewarded or punished—punishment to consist of varying degrees of suffering, ending in destruction.

In the discussion which followed Mr. William Adamson, of Edinburgh, remarked that "the question of the future state was one which was bound to be taken up and discussed by the Evangelical Union. But whatever opinions they might hold, they could not hold the doctrine of annihilation. It was absurd in every possible way they placed it. It was founded on a false anthropology, theology, and exegesis, and was not worth half an hour's thought. Mr. Becket thought "the larger hope had a dangerous tendency, and might lead men to go on in sin, thinking that perhaps after a short time—a duration of punishment, they would be delivered."

In his reply, Mr. Morton stated that "he had treated the subject after an historical method, and had endeavoured to present the present state of this question. There was a revolt against the old theory. Hundreds of ministers in England were searching into this question of annihilation, and dozens of ministers occupying very prominent positions in the Church were moving towards it."

I may mention that the evangelical Union numbers nearly a hundred churches, and has for one of its professors, James Morison, D.D., whose expulsion from the United Secession Church upwards of thirty years ago, for his belief that Christ was a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, caused so much interest in Scotland. This body has a weekly organ published at Glasgow, entitled the *Christian News*, to which I am indebted for these facts.

Another circumstance which, though in a different way, shows the progress made by the Scripture truth concerning man's nature, is the subject chosen this year for the seventh series of the Cunningham Lectures: "The Bible Theory of Man." The course consists of six lectures which were delivered in Edinburgh in March, by the Rev. John Laidlaw, of Aberdeen. The headings of the lectures indicate the scope of the course which, as was to be expected, was opposed to what is maintained in the RAINBOW. In the closing lecture, "Conditional Immortality" was especially reviewed. These are (1.) "The Bible account of man's Origin." (2.) "Man's Nature: What is tthe Biblical Psychology?" (3.) "The Doctrine of the Divine Image." (4.) "The Constitution of man as affected by sin." (5.) "The Psychology of the New Nature." (6.) "The Future Life and the Resurrection." J. CAMERON.

Edinburgh.

---

## LITERATURE.

*Jesus Christ and Him Crucified.* By J. J. Andrews. Islington: Upper-street. Birmingham: R. Roberts.

THE author of this work proposes to constrast "the truth concerning Jesus" with certain views popularly entertained, which he thinks subversive of that truth. In examining popular errors concerning Christ's

Digitized by Google

work he insists most of all that those who consider that his salvation consists in rescuing sinners from an immortality of misery, and conferring upon the redeemed happiness and glory superadded to immortality, already possessed by all men, present a false view of his work; because the wages of sin being death, when that comes to pass it is extinction. There is no eternal life out of Christ. This is the gift of God in him. Christ saves from the utter destruction due to sin, raising up the sleeping saints when he comes a second time "without sin (sin offering) unto salvation." Consequent upon these tenets, Mr. Andrews denies the existence in any case of an eternity of woe.

In order to propound his views with consecntiveness and clearness the author divides his treatise into three parts. In the first of these he considers Christ as a prophet, in the second as a priest, and in the third as a king.

Under each head are several divisions, such as the Gospel of the kingdom of God; the second appearing of Jesus Christ; the reward promised to the righteous; the punishment of the wicked, &c. A very considerable portion of this part of the work is conspicuous for unnecessary iteration. The author is never content with proving his positions, he heaps argument upon argument, and quotation upon quotation, as the lawyer described by Erskine, who never considered that he had established his client's case until he had crowded it with a profusion of authorities and arguments, some of which were sure to be wrong. Our author too frequently brings in very disputable passages, which he could well do without. "The Gospel of the Kingdom," our author interprets as the restoration of Israel under their king, their Messiah, when he will come to rule as the son of David. What Mr. Andrews terms the conditions of salvation, are faith and baptism: he does not regard the ordinance as a symbol of putting off heathenism or Judaism, and embracing by the help of the Holy Spirit the religion of Christ; he enforces the rite as indispensable in every case. There is some danger in the terms adopted in this argument of representing the rite itself as a saviour.

The chapter on the second advent is undoubtedly one of the best written, and the best argued in the book. It is free from redundancy, and contains many solemn and instructive paragraphs, and some strikingly original thoughts. The chapter on the reward of the righteous deserves the encomium pronounced upon that last noticed. It in the most forcible manner presents Christ as "the Life-giver."

*Diabolism:* being an Inquiry into the origin of the current theory of the Devil and Evil Spirits, and its cognate Doctrine of Hell-fire. By Edward Turney. London: Nichols, Long Acre.

This is not a calm and philosophical inquiry into the important subject of which it treats. There is an affectation of smartness, and a vein of irony throughout. All believers in the old doctrines are ridiculed unsparingly; and efforts to prove the tenets absurd are made by arguments which really are so. If there be any cogency in Mr. Turney's logic, he ought to abandon all idea of spiritual existence, for what he considers proves that there are no evil spirits would tell equally against the existence of angels; and to prove that there is no devil by his method is to prove that there is

Digitized by Google

no God. He forgets that arguments which prove too much prove nothing.

At the outset he affirms that science is silent upon the devil, *ergo* there is no such being. In what department of science do we learn anything of Gabriel who stands in the presence of God? There are no vestiges in geological or mineralogical *phenomena*, of the ministry of angels in the formation of the world; and the telescope may in vain sweep the range of the heavens for signs in the stars that angels dwell among them. Neither in physical nor metaphysical research is there evidence of a crucified and risen Redeemer, or of the great truth that he who ascended will descend again in glory to rule over a regenerated world. Yet all these things our author believes upon the evidence that is appropriate to them. He falls into the error of materialists, so common among medical men, looking for demonstration where it is impossible, and where moral evidence alone is applicable, and sufficient.

The work is voluminous for the subject; scarcely one-third of the twenty-two chapters into which it is divided bearing in any way direct or indirect upon the object; and written in a strain as if the author was desirous to show his wit, which is frequently rather coarse banter; and his learning, for which he deserves much credit. The writer is however very much in earnest, evidently holding a sincere conviction of the truth of what he writes. His would-be humorous description of the devil jumping down the serpent's throat in order the more effectually to tempt Eve, and getting out again without sticking, is a parody on the short sad narrative of Genesis which approaches the profane.

According to Mr. Turney the law of creation by which all moral beings are made with a will independent, whether angels or men—able to stand yet free to fall—is a reproach to him who so ordained it. He says the popular belief represents heaven as an insecure place, and avers that there was no casting out of erring angels, because none ever erred. If such were the case, he seems to think some door would be left open for their re-entrance, as in the beautiful story of Paradise and the Peri, by Moore. In fine, our author tortures forth all the superstitions of heathenism and corrupt Christianity to make a belief in the existence of evil spirits ridiculous, whereas in fact all those superstitions, and almost all others, arose from distorted views of some great, but not ultimate truth.

*The Creation;* or, Moses and Science in Harmony. By the Rev. Alexander Stewart, M.D., LL.D. London: Elliot Stock.

ANOTHER effort, undoubtedly a very able one, to reconcile the irreconcilable. We believe Moses thoroughly and entirely right; but the reconciliation of modern science with the Mosaic cosmogony is simply impossible. Nevertheless Dr. Stewart's book is full of valuable information, expressed in clear and vigorous language. When science is pleased to give up her baseless assumptions, and deal with facts instead of theory, Scripture will hold out the right hand of fellowship to her, but not before.

*Poetical Leaflets* for the Sorrowing. *Scripture Leaflets* for the Sorrowing. By G. Washington Moon, F.R.S.L. Hatchards.

THESE are in packets at 1s. each. The Poetical Leaflets are good; the Scripture Leaflets well arranged.

Digitized by Google

*The Bursted Shell.* By Silas Henn. Stock.

Mr. Henn removes the "integument of the common belief" respecting immortality and future punishment. He is always a thoughtful writer.

*Emmie*, the Schoolmaster's Darling. By Evelyn Grey. Stock.

A pretty little story for children.

*A Royal Service*, and other Poems. By Jean Sophia Pigott. Partridge.

Beautiful poems, in which loving Christian hearts will delight. We especially commend "The Christian's Point of Honour" to those well-to-do disciples who give as little as they can to their Lord. If it doesn't bite them they are skin hardened.

*Humanity and the Man*: A Poem. By William Sharpe, M.D., Q.U.I., Army Medical Department, Author of "The Conqueror's Dream," and other Poems. Dublin: Hodges. London: Simpkins.

An historical poem of great power, quite in the style of "Paradise Lost."

*Chimes from Bygone Years.* By Charlotte B. Wheeler. Stock.

An admirable selection of thoughts for daily readings. A better book of the kind we do not know. The Bishop of Ripon contributes a graceful preface.

*Biblical Things not generally known.* London: Elliot Stock.

Is "a collection of facts, notes, and information concerning much that is rare, quaint, curious, obscure, and little known in relation to Biblical subjects." It is published in monthly parts, price 3d. We wish the serial success, as it is sure to be useful to Sunday-school teachers and others.

## NOTICES.

"Cyprus in Sacred Story," and "The First Step in Jewish Restoration," Sermons by the Editor, preached to his congregation at Maberly Chapel, Kingsland, will appear in the Rainbow. Subscribers wishing extra copies of the October and November issues will please let their booksellers know in good time.

We are glad to learn that the new edition of Mr. J. B. Rotherham's Emphasised New Testament, thoroughly revised, is likely to be issued in a short time. Our readers generally are aware that this work is a complete translation of the whole Testament from the text of Dr. Tregelles.

"*Desiring to Depart and to be with Christ.*"—This Tract may be had from the author, W. Laing, 51, Buccleuch Street, Edinburgh, at 4d. per dozen, or 2s. 6d. per 100.

"W. W. J."—The cause of truth will make way, notwithstanding the strength of existing prejudice, if its friends are heartily loyal to it. Our correspondent orders a parcel of "Rainbow Tracts," and adds: "I am glad to see you believe the British belong to the house of Israel."

"N. S."—We promise you a paper ere long on the subject which excites your interest—as well it may—that of Anglo-Israel. "He shall cause them that come of Jacob to take root: Israel shall blossom and bud,

Digitized by Google

and fill the face of the world with fruit." If for "Israel" in this passage you substitute "England," you will have the truth, that English are Israelites. The great colonising power—there is only one in the world that has been successful—*must* represent the second son of Joseph, to whom the dying patriarch Jacob gave the magnificent birthright. "His seed shall become a multitude of nations." We have seen all this for thirty years, and shall be thankful if you see it also; for it is a truth of profound importance both in the history and destiny of the world.

"J. S." (Toronto.) The vast majority of the so-called "Religious Tracts" contain error respecting the nature of man, and the character of God. The "RAINBOW TRACTS" are the beginning of a series which, if carried on, will do something to counteract falsehood, and diffuse truth. But it cannot be carried on without generous contributions from the friends of truth. "J. S." says, "Occasional lists of really good and useful tracts for general circulation would be desirable. Almost all the tracts issued by the principal societies are steadily upholding and diffusing the errors we deprecate." True. Well, we are ready for this service also if our friends desire it. We simply state the fact, and wait their will. Meantime, we repeat the notice inserted last month:—

RAINBOW TRACTS—The pamphlets "Life everlasting" and "The Ministry of Evil" are out of print. We are thankful to hear from time to time that they have comforted many hearts, We hope this month to print a large edition, in neat small book form, for gratuitous circulation. At the same time we shall issue a new pamphlet entitled "The Life the Light," uniform with the others, so that they can be enclosed in letters by those who wish to do good in this way. This will be followed by a Tract on the "Responsibility of Christian Teachers." There are a few copies on hand of "The Rich Man and Lazarus," and "The Scripture Doctrine of a Future Life." Friends wanting any of these "Rainbow Tracts" will please apply to the Editor, 34, Sandringham Road, Kingsland, London, E.

"B. C." (Maitland).—Thanks for kind letter and renewed subscription. Your remark that there is far more "religion" so-called—"than practical proof of self-denying love to Jesus," is painfully true. There are many who instead of asking how much they can lay at the Saviour's feet, make it a point to give as little as they can. They quarrel with collections for the cause of that glorious Redeemer to whom they owe every thing. It is shamefully inconsistent. It is the spirit of Judas. "Why was this waste of the ointment made?" O that all the professed friends of Christ knew the delicious meaning of the word "sacrifice." If they did, with what joy would they give money to promote his truth in the world!

"D. S. Y."—Great events will crowd upon the world soon. If we are to do any thing for the honour of the Lord, it must be done speedily, and if it is to have any virtue in it, it must be done heartily. Never was there a louder cry for heart in the divine service. Men who look for the speedy return of the Master cannot offer him unmeaning form, and senseless ceremony. They will offer him themselves, and he will graciously smile upon the offering. Christ wants hearts; let him have them! He knows how to care for those who care for him, and his honour should be our ruling motive.

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

OCTOBER, 1878.

## CYPRUS IN SACRED STORY.

BY THE EDITOR.

"Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed into Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus." —Acts xiii. 1-4.

"CYPRUS" is mentioned eight times in the book from which these words are taken; yet it has for centuries been nothing but a name. This is the case with a great number of Biblical localities, some of which have both an historical and a prophetical value that can scarcely be over estimated. War, however, frequently stamps obscure places with importance, and brings into political prominence even villages whose names were previously unknown except to their inhabitants and neighbours. In other cases war, or diplomacy springing out of war, effects a resurrection of regions once celebrated but long utterly forgotten. This is the case with the Island of Cyprus in the Mediterranean Sea.

Respecting the island itself and its deeply interesting association with the early history of the Gospel, and that of some of its noble advocates, I shall speak presently; but just a few words concerning the great mid-world sea in which it is found will be suggestive of thought to those who see in the progress of events the unfolding of the purposes of God. The word Mediterranean of course means middle land, and indicates the geographical position of this vast sheet of water which is enclosed or nearly enclosed with land, communicating only with the Atlantic Ocean by the Straits of Gibraltar, which, at the narrowest part, are only fifteen miles across. The Mediterranean lies between Europe, Asia, and Africa, and is



Digitized by Google

associated more or less directly with many of the great events of history, and the great empires of antiquity. Its coasts were the seats of the earliest civilised nations, the Egyptians, Phœnicians, Carthaginians, Greeks, and Romans. Its principal islands are the Balearic isles, Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, Elba, the Lipari Islands, Malta, the Ionian Isles, Candia—the ancient Crete—and Cyprus. Its length from east to west is about two thousand miles, and its general breadth from four hundred to eight hundred miles.

The Mediterranean is repeatedly referred to in the Bible as "the great sea." Thus: "And as for the western border, ye shall even have the great sea for a border, this shall be your west border." (Num. xxxiv. 6.) "From the wilderness and this Lebanon even unto the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, and unto the great sea toward the going down of the sun, shall be your coast." (Josh. i. 4.) "And it came to pass when all the kings which were on this side Jordan, in the hills and in the valleys, and in all the coasts of the great sea over against Lebanon . . . heard thereof, they gathered themselves together to fight with Joshua and with Israel with one accord" (ix. 1, 2). "And the west border was to the great sea, and the coast thereof. This is the coast of the children of Judah round about according to their families" (xv. 12). "Behold, I have divided unto you by lot those nations that remain, to be an inheritance for your tribes, from Jordan, with all the nations that I have cut off, even unto the great sea westward" (xxiii. 4). Ezekiel predicts the healing of the Dead Sea, and says that its "fish shall be according to their kinds, as the fish of the great sea, exceeding many" (chap. xlvii. 10). And, not to multiply references in proof of the fact that the Mediterranean holds an important place in the Sacred Book, it is at once historically and prophetically important to notice that it is the scene of Daniel's wonderful vision of the contention for universal empire. "I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea; and four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another" (vii. 2, 3). It is worthy of notice that Napoleon Bonaparte, one of the latest aspirants to a sceptre that should rule the world, was born in an island of this famous sea. Happily the time is coming when the last of the beasts—men that obtain empire by brute force—will disappear for ever, and one "like the Son of Man will receive from the Ancient of Days dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Yea, the time is coming when victory over the last of the beasts will be celebrated in triumphant song. Here is a sketch of the thrilling scene: "And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of

Digitized by Google

Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of the nations. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy; for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest." (Rev. xv. 2-4.)

Cyprus—British rule over which is the result of recent diplomacy—has suddenly sprung into universal notice.* Whatever we may think of the policy that secretly brought about the relationship between England and this Turkish island in the Mediterranean, it is my impression that a vision clearer than man's sees services to be rendered and issues to be reached by that relationship which come not within the province of statesmen. Political criticism, whether favourable or adverse to the policy of the Minister who has taken Asia Minor under British protection, can only deal with the merest incidents of the problem. Its essential meaning is known only to the King of nations; and the events of his ruling, or overruling providence will reveal it to thoughtful Christian men in due time. We at least who scorn a cosmogony whose basis is a fortuitous concourse of atoms, and an atheism which leaves the government of

* Of the importance of Cyprus as a military station, little need here be said. Taken in connection with Gibraltar in the west of the Mediterranean, and Malta in the centre, it forms one of a series of strong places which will give to Britain a preponderance of power in every direction. It will directly command the entrance to the Suez Canal, the coasts of Palestine and Syria, and the southern provinces of Asia Minor. Even more than this might be said, if our present concern were not rather with the island itself.

It has been suggested that Cyprus is likely to prove a field for emigration, and a gentleman who says he has lived there for many years offers some good advice on the subject. He states that the winter is short and cold, the summer long and hot, but not oppressively so on account of the sweet Mediterranean breezes, which make the evenings particularly cool; and, he adds, people of regular habits will find it not only free from sickness, but beneficial if they do not indulge too freely in the beautiful fruit which grows nearly wild in every part of the island. "The English farmer will reap a good harvest, with moderate toil and careful study of the seasons; labour is cheap and plentiful, but the natives, like most Orientals, are lazy and want looking after." After enumerating the chief vegetable and mineral resources of the island, the writer observes that the buildings are not worth mentioning, but with English builders and cheap and plentiful materials villages will soon grow into towns. The inhabitants are good-natured, honest, quiet, and hospitable; the principal language is Greek, Turkish and Italian being spoken by the upper classes only.

The inauguration of a new era will be sure to attract tourists and temporary visitors, who will come to spend money, and whose numbers will increase in proportion to the increase of good accommodation and the conveniences of travel. Perhaps not one of the regions traversed by St. Paul and evangelised in the Apostolic age has been so little visited in our day as Cyprus. This has been due to causes which will now cease to operate, and when steamers call frequently and regularly, and suitable arrangements have been made, there will certainly be an influx of Christian pilgrims of the most intelligent class."—*B. H. Cowper.*



Digitized by Google

the universe to chance, are bound to believe that it is no mere accident, unintelligible both in its source and progress, that brings the lands of the Bible under the generous guardianship of the imperial race that owes its greatness to that wonderful book. The responsibility which we thus assume is great, and no doubt it involves a series of severe troubles, but responsibility and trouble are among the things which make a man or a nation; and if we acquit ourselves justly and nobly in the great task before us, with God and men looking on, we shall reap the honour that follows great deeds, and the lasting gratitude of emancipated peoples.

Cyprus lies between Asia Minor and Syria, a locality which will enable us to wield our destined influence in the restoration to Palestine of such of the ancient race, whose fathers dwelt there, as wish to occupy the famous land. The island is about 148 English miles long, and for two-thirds of the length it is about 40 broad. It was one of the earliest fields of missionary enterprise out of Palestine. The Pro-consul, Sergius Paulus, was the first Christian ruler, and as such his name is invested with peculiar interest. He was instructed in "the doctrine of the Lord" by the great apostle of the Gentiles. Here is the beautiful story; Barnabas and Saul "being sent forth by the Holy Spirit, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus. And when they were at Salamis, they preached the word of God in the synagogues of the Jews; and they had also John as their minister. And when they had gone through the isle unto Paphos, they found a certain sorcerer, a false prophet, a Jew whose name was Bar-Jesus; who was with the deputy of the country, Sergius Paulus, a prudent man; who called for Barnabas and Saul, and desired to hear the word of God. But Elymas the sorcerer—for so is his name by interpretation—withstood them, seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith. Then Saul—who also is called Paul—filled with the Holy Spirit, fixed his eyes on him and said, O full of all subtlety and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? And now, behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season. And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness; and he went about seeking some to lead him by the hand. Then the deputy, when he saw what was done, believed, being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord." (Acts xiii. 4-12.)

It will be noted here that the energy of the reproof administered to the impostor, followed as it was by an immediate punishment, must have filled the pro-consul and all present with a reverent awe. The speaker was surely entrusted with a Divine message, for he attributes the judgment on the magician to "the hand of the Lord." But even here mercy mingled with judgment, for the blindness of Elymas was only "for a season." The conversion of the ruler and the confusion of the false prophet whom he had been

Digitized by Google

entertaining at his court, must have been speedily noised abroad over the island, and no doubt paved the way of the good news of which Paul and Barnabas were the bearers.

The character of Barnabas is one of singular beauty, and Cyprus has the honour of being his birth-place. "He was a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." It is a perpetual glory to hear that said of any man in the pages of the New Testament. "Much people," by his instrumentality, "were added to the Lord." His name is given as Joses in our version, but the apostles surnamed himBarnabas—the Son of Consolation—a proof of their deep love to their brother, and a memorial of his effective teaching; and his whole-hearted consecration to the Master* is recorded in the sublime fact that he sold his property in Cyprus, "and brought the money and laid it at the apostles' feet." Unselfish devotion to the Redeemer, though it may not be recorded in the New Testament, will be written in "the book of life."—Christ takes notice of it, and *that* is the highest possible record.

The Church at Antioch contained some noble members, "prophets and teachers," Barnabas of Cyprus, Simeon Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen, Herod's foster-brother, and, though last in the list, not the least star in this Oriental constellation—Saul of Tarsus, called Paul from the time of the conversion of the ruler of Cyprus, and ever afterwards, probably at the wish and out of respect to his noble convert, Sergius Paulus.† Now, what do we men of the West owe to the labours and memory of these men

---

* On the west of Salamis, in the direction of Paphos, Pococke saw a church and monastery dedicated to Barnabas, and a grotto where he is said to have been buried, after suffering martyrdom in the reign of Nero.

† It is remarkable that two men called Sergius Paulus are described in very similar terms by two physicians who wrote in Greek, the one a heathen, the other a Christian. The heathen writer is Galen. He speaks of his cotemporary as a man interested and well versed in philosophy. The Christian writer is St. Luke, who tells us here that the governor of Cyprus was a "prudent man" who "desired to hear the word of God." This governor seems to have been of a candid and inquiring mind; nor will this philosophical disposition be thought inconsistent with his connection with the Jewish impostor whom Saul and Barnabas found at the Paphian Court, by those who are acquainted with the intellectual and religious tendencies of the age. For many years before this time and many years after, impostors from the East, pretending to magical powers, had great influence over the Roman mind. All the Greek and Latin literature of the empire, from Horace to Lucian, abounds in proof of the prevalent credulity of this sceptical period. Unbelief, when it has become conscious of its weakness, is often glad to give its hand to superstition. The faith of educated Rome was utterly gone. We can hardly wonder, when the East was thrown open,—the land of mystery,—the fountain of the earliest migrations,—the cradle of the earliest religions,—that the imagination both of the populace and the aristocracy of Rome became fanatically excited, and that they greedily welcomed the most absurd and degrading superstition. Not only was the metropolis of the empire crowded with "hungry Greeks," but "Syrian fortune-tellers" flocked into all the

Digitized by Google

of the East? More than we can ever pay. We shall be in their debt for ever! They have told us truths that will outlast all the royal dynasties of earth, and flourish in moral beauty to the glory of our Father in heaven, when the great transformation consequent upon the reign of Messiah the Prince shall make our sorrow-smitten and thorn-bearing world the very paradise of God.

But we can send, and must send back to these orient lands the truths they sent us. We have planted the British flag on the Island of Cyprus; but that is only an official act symbolic of a national purpose to benefit the people. We must also plant the standard of the Cross there—ay, the standard of the Crown there; for the Saviour of sinners is also the Prince of the House of David, the Lion of the tribe of Judah; and as the slain Lamb, he alone can break the seals from the title deeds of the Holy Land. (Rev. v. 1-9.)

And the possession of the Holy Land by its divinely appointed owners is the only solution of the vexed "Eastern question." Neither Turk nor Russian has the slightest right in Palestine. The former has "trodden it down" for many weary generations. He cannot rule; he can only oppress. And the latter would assuredly consult his own safety if he would crush the ambition to lord it over Syria. All lands belong to God, of course; "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein; for he hath founded it upon the seas and established it upon the floods;" but about this land there is something peculiar which marks it off from all other lands, and its destiny according to many promises will exceed in splendour its history at its best estate during the reign of Solomon the Magnificent.

Besides, and above all, the throne of David waits for the Messiah, the divinely anointed occupant. The Lord Jesus is now in heaven waiting the time appointed of the Father to take possession of the throne of David, that he may rule all nations from the hill of Zion. This glorious event *must* take place if inspired prophets are to be credited; and if we interpret aright the present state of Europe and Asia, the time is not far distant now. The predictions of the seventy-second psalm and scores of other Scriptures must be fulfilled, for "the Lord hath spoken."

The following from Dr. Davidson's little book* will be read with interest:—

"Cyprus was at a very early period famous in connection with the worship of Venus, the Syrian Astarte or Ashtaroth, 'the goddess

---

haunts of public amusement. Athens and Corinth did not now contribute the greatest or the worst part of the "dregs" of Rome; but (to adopt Juvenal's use of that river of Antioch we have lately been describing) "the Orontes itself flowed into the Tiber."—*Dean Howson.*

* Cyprus, England's New Possession: Its place in Bible History. By J. Thain Davidson, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton.

Digitized by Google

of the Zidonians' referred to in several places of the Old Testament.

"The Israelites were often tempted to join in the worship of this deity, and, as you may remember, were adjured in the most solemn manner to put away from them 'their strange gods and *Ashtaroth*.' The same goddess was known as Aphrodite (ἀφρὸς being the Greek for froth or foam), because she was supposed to have been born from the foam of the sea. She was also called *Cypria*, because much worshipped in the island; and *Paphia*, on account of a splendid temple in her honour that was erected at Paphos, where also she had a celebrated altar on which it was believed not a drop of rain ever fell.

"The Venus-worship of Cyprus was fearfully licentious, and, as may be supposed, had a disastrous effect upon the character and habits of the people. One dare not even mention the vices which reigned without restraint amongst them; and as the indulgence of the lowest passions was consecrated by the sanction of their religion, the Cypriotes became notorious for grosser forms of unblushing immorality than probably prevailed in any other part of the East. Well might an Apostle speak of the 'lasciviousness, lusts, revellings, and abominable idolatries' wherein they thought it strange that the Christian converts would not run with them to the same excess of riot. The polluted worship of Cyprus had been originally brought over from Assyria or Phœnicia; and as from its geographical position the island was naturally the meeting-place of the Oriental and the Greek modes of thought and forms of social life, the beautiful creations of Western genius became mingled with the gross superstitions of the East, and, as Athanasius remarks, ministered to the deification of lust.

"The Island of Cyprus is mentioned seven or eight times in the New Testament, and occupies so honourable a place in the early history of Christianity, that we may well wonder so little attention has been given to it. We must go back to the Old Testament, however, to find the first allusion to it and to its people in Holy Scripture.

"Indeed, if we turn to Genesis x. 1-4, we are carried back to an era as remote as that of Noah himself. 'Now these are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth: and unto them were born sons after the flood. The sons of Japheth: Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, etc., . . . and the sons of Javan: Elishah, Tarshish, *Kittim*, and Dodanim.'* The family of Kittim, or Chittim, is believed to have migrated from Phœnicia to Cyprus, and to have founded the town of Citium, afterwards called Chitti, on the eastern coast of the island, which came to be known as the Isle of Chittima. Josephus expressly

* It is interesting to observe that in the Septuagint the two last of these names appear as Κήτιοι, Ῥόδιοι, Cetians, Rhodians.

Digitized by Google

states that 'Chittima is now called Cyprus;' and Cicero speaks of the Citians or Cyprians as a colony from Phœnicia.

"The next reference in Scripture will be found in Numbers xxiv. 24, in one of the inspired utterances of the prophet Balaam, where he predicts that a fleet should proceed from the island for the destruction of Assyria. 'And ships shall come from the coast of Chittim and shall afflict Asshur, and shall afflict Eber, and he also shall perish for ever.' Other passages speak of an intimate connection of a mercantile character between Chittim and the Phœnician coast, and chiefly of close relations with Tyre, the principal city of that seaboard, and long regarded as mistress of the seas. There is a remarkable prediction in Isaiah xxiii. 1 and 12, relating to the destruction of that wealthy and luxurious city, and intimating to the merchants of Tarshish, probably some southern port on the Spanish coast, on which a colony of Phœnicians had settled, that in vain should they send their ships to Tyre, and that as they touched at the island of Chittim they should learn the news of its ruin. 'The burden of Tyre. Howl, ye ships of Tarshish: for it is laid waste, so that there is no house, no entering in: from the land of Chittim it is revealed to them. . . . And he said, Thou shalt no more rejoice, O thou oppressed virgin, daughter of Zidon: arise, pass over to Chittim: there also shalt thou have no rest.'

"The articles of merchandise which, according to the prophet Ezekiel, Tarshish supplied to Tyre, are precisely those which from other authorities we know to have been the chief productions of the Spanish Peninsula. As to silver and iron, we have the testimony of Diodorus and Pliny that these metals were found in considerable abundance; and to the present day the lead and tin mines are worked with energy and success.

"We have evidence that the Phœnician traders made distant voyages to Western Europe, reaching as far as Great Britain itself: and it is interesting to think that so early as the times of Isaiah, there was a regular traffic between the Spanish and the Tyrian coasts, and that to this reference is made in the passage which has just been quoted.

"Turning to the prophecy of Jeremiah ii. 10, we find another interesting allusion to the island. The Lord is reproaching his covenant people for their unfaithfulness to himself. Although blest with the knowledge of the true Jehovah, they had forsaken his worship, and given their hearts to idols. 'What iniquity,' asks God, 'have your fathers found in me, that they are gone far from me?' Such inconstancy was not to be found even amongst the idolatrous heathen; as Cicero long ago observed, there is nothing in regard to which nations are more steadfast and unalterable than the deities whom they worship. The Lord appeals to this fact, and contrasts the constancy of the Gentile peoples whose gods were 'vanities,' with the fickleness of the house of Israel, privileged as

Digitized by Google

they were with the knowledge of the true God. He bids them go to the west and to the east, and see whether they could discover instances of such unfaithfulness. 'For pass over to the isles of Chittim, and see; and send unto Kedar, and consider diligently, and see if there be such a thing: hath a nation changed their gods, which are yet no gods? But my people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit.' The force of the passage will appear the greater when it is borne in mind that from the higher elevations of Syria in clear weather the mountains of Chittim were distinctly perceptible."

## NOTES AND COMMENTS.

UNDER this heading it is proposed, from time to time, to preserve in the pages of the RAINBOW some brief record of such passing events, side-lights on Scripture interpretation, and germs of thought, as a somewhat wide range of reading may afford, *bearing directly or indirectly on the subjects to which these pages are specially devoted.* Any contributions to this store, addressed W. MAUDE, 14 (late 7), Moray Road, Tollington Park, N., will receive due attention.

### THE WESLEYANS AND ETERNAL TORMENT.

THIS burning question—literally such—continues to give our Methodist brethren some trouble, and is likely soon to give them more. The Rev. William Impey has recently resigned his office as General Superintendent of the Wesleyan Missions in South-Eastern Africa. Some time ago Mr. Impey, with a noble courage of his convictions, wrote to the Mission Secretaries in London, expressing his inability any longer to enforce on his brethren, or the Kaffir converts of the Mission, the "plain grammatical sense" of the words in the Wesleyan Catechism, that "hell is a dark and bottomless pit, full of fire and brimstone, in which the wicked will be punished for ever and ever, by having their bodies tormented by the fire and their souls by a sense of the wrath of God." Thereupon he was peremptorily ordered to come to London, "to confer with them," the result being that he was compelled not only to resign his mission work, but all connexion with the Wesleyan ministry, *after forty years earnest and successful service;* no recognition of those services being offered in any form by the Conference. Truly the tender mercies of the orthodox are cruel. But worse remains behind. The chosen apologist of Methodist doctrine, the Rev. G. W. Olver, the Fernley lecturer on "Life and Death" at Bradford, has been weighed in the balances of the Conference, and found wanting in the brimstone element. The lecture was not considered satisfactory, the usual vote of thanks was omitted, and

Digitized by Google

the lecture is published by the lecturer without any official imprimatur. Under these circumstances Mr. Olver declined to accept the *honorarium* provided for by the Foundation. We may on a future occasion refer more fully to the lecture itself.

### JOHN WESLEY ON MORAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND SCRIPTURE.

MR. IMPEY, in his pamphlet, "Why I leave the Wesleyan Methodist Church" (printed for private circulation), thus writes to Dr. W. Morley Punshon:—"I may admit that the future 'punishment' of the wicked is 'everlasting' in the sense that in itself it is final and irreversible, but that such punishment consists in the conscious and eternal agony or suffering of a living soul, I cannot believe. I do not believe that the general teaching of God's word warrants such a doctrine, nor do I believe that this doctrine is consistent with the revealed character of God. I think that the few texts upon which so much stress is laid as asserting it, are not incapable of an interpretation which shall harmonise with the many in an opposite direction. Were the difficulties presented by the few texts alluded to, even greater than they are, I would claim to apply *a principle asserted by John Wesley himself* in discussing a very analogous topic—that of 'the horrible decree' of Predestination. This, though held by multitudes of divines in his day, was by him rejected as 'making Revelation contradict itself,' as being grounded 'on such an interpretation of some texts, as flatly contradicts all the other texts, and as being contrary to the whole scope and tenor of Scripture.' 'But you will prove it by Scripture,' Mr. Wesley writes in a well-known passage. . . . . 'Whatever that Scripture proves, it can never prove this. What its true meaning may be, this cannot be its true meaning. Do you ask, 'What is its true meaning, then?' If I say 'I know not,' you have gained nothing, for there are many Scriptures, the true sense whereof neither you nor I shall know till death is swallowed up in victory. But this I know, *better it were to say it had no sense at all than to say it had such a sense as this.* It cannot mean, whatever it mean beside, that the God of truth is a liar. Let it mean what it will, it cannot mean that the Judge of all the world is unjust. No Scripture can mean that God is not love, or that his mercy is not over all his works; that is, whatever it prove beside, no Scripture can prove predestination."

Surely Mr. Impey and his Wesleyan brethren may claim the right of reading Matthew xxv. in the light of this sound canon of interpretation as well as Romans ix.

### HELL IN A ROMISH "PARADISE PLAY."

MR. GROHMAN, in his amusing "Gaddings" among the primitive people of the Tyrolese Alps, gives a description of what they call

Digitized by Google

a "Paradise Play,"—much the same thing as the ancient Mystery Play—still one of the most popular of Tyrolese institutions. This is how hell is described :—

"Here is hell, fiery demoniacal hell, with all its infernal machinery, instruments of torture, and trap-falls for human folly. The centre of the stage is occupied by a portable forge, upon which a bright coal fire is burning; a large butcher's block stands to the right, while huge knives, gigantic tongs, and brightly polished axes litter the foreground. To the left of the forge we see a couple of huge boilers, filled with steaming water. The stage is lit up by means of the red screens, and loud howling and gnashing of teeth and the most piercing shrieks augment the horrors of the picture. A discordant blast of trumpets announces the advent of the archangel Lucifer, the master of this fearful abode. He is attended by a troupe of young imps and devils on a small scale, who jump and caper round him in wicked gleefulness. Seating himself on his throne, the butcher's gory block, he catches hold of the insignia of his office, a heavy iron chain painted a bright red to represent a red heat, and a pitchfork. Round his neck is hung a chain of teeth, human fingers (of wax)—those that were forfeited to him for slander and perjury—and bunches of lank witches' hair, and several dried toads. Thus arrayed, Lucifer holds court. Difficult questions are discussed. The new Creation is spoken of, and the feasibility of overthrowing God the Father's supremacy. We hear of the various weak points of humanity, pride, lust, jealousy, greed, &c.; how advantage could be taken of each one, and how God's influence could be counteracted. The consultation is presently interrupted by two imps, in whom we recognise two of the angels of the chaos scene, and who apparently gave heed to Lucifer's words, and followed him down to his underground domain. . . . ."

But they are speedily disenchanted, as the following indignant expostulation, addressed to the seducing spirit himself, painfully proves :—

"'The fowls you promised us are burnt to a cinder, and the wine is pure vinegar, and the heat is intolerable,' they cry out in a pitious tone, but a loud peal of fiendish laughter is the only answer, and Lucifer holds his sides at the abject state of dismay evinced by his victims." (p. 31.)

## LUKE XV. 12.

An interesting side-light is cast upon this detail in what has been called "the crown of our Lord's parables," by a strange patriarchal custom recorded by General Cesnola, in his book on Cyprus, as being still widely observed in that island :—

"When a peasant becomes too old for labour in the fields, and has sons able to take his place, he voluntarily despoils himself, sometimes to the extent of his whole property, and endows them

Digitized by Google

with it. 'I know personally,' writes General Cesnola, 'a respectable old man who had four sons and two daughters, to the latter of whom he gave each a small house and garden on their marriage-day, and the rest of his property he divided equally among his sons, retaining absolutely nothing for himself. He now lives upon the bounty of one of these sons. It not unfrequently happens, however, that the son illtreats his aged father, who, after having passed the greater part of his life in easy circumstances, becomes in his latter days a beggar.'"

## "THUS SAITH THE LORD."

SCRIPTURE words are not always Scripture. "Every Scripture God inspired is profitable;" but the words we quote as inspired Scripture must convey the Divine meaning, or God's truth itself will become a lie upon man's lips. At a temperance meeting some time ago, some one present quoted, as Scripture, for the encouragement of teetotallers, the words "All that drink water shall be comforted." These words are found in Ezek. xxxi. 16, which reads thus: "I made the nations to shake at the sound of his fall, when I cast him down to hell (*Sheol*) with them that descend into the pit: and all the trees of Eden, the choice and best of Lebanon, all that drink water shall be comforted in the nether parts of the earth." If our teetotal friend had referred to the context of the words he quoted, he would have seen at once that Ezekiel was not speaking for or against temperance, but was recounting the fall of the King of Assyria to *Sheol*, or "the nether parts of the earth," a locality in which water is not popularly supposed to be plentiful.

W. MAUDE.

---

## THE HOPE OF THE WORLD.

JESUS, the world's predicted Lord,
The Church's Bridegroom-King,
The sinner's one true Priest with God,
Thy Advent's hope we sing.

Oh, quickly let thy Kingdom come,
And stretch from shore to shore;
The nations hail thy kindling light,
And bow with sacred awe.

Then from her bridal-chamber, clad
With every saintly grace,
Thy Church shall come, and glory-crowned,
Beside thee take her place.

Digitized by Google

As kings and priests with thee, the saints
  Shall reign, and rule, and bless,
And bound in golden cords of love,
  The world thy name confess.

No more shall each benighted soul
  Be taught the Lord to know;
For Christ the vailless face of God
  To all mankind will show.

And still, as long bright ages roll,
  The earth's new joy shall spring,
Nor sin across its radiant disc
  A passing shadow fling.

The Lord its everlasting light,
  His love made perfect here—
Amid ten thousand orbs above
  No world shall shine so fair.

* D. M. A.

---

## THE SON OF MAN JUDGING THE NATIONS.

(*Continued from page* 406.)

WE have not called into question the commonly received interpretation of Matt. xxv. without assigning our reasons for so doing. The reader will remember our objections in last issue.

But these are not all. We have other grounds of objection, which we will now state, comparing Scripture with Scripture. We object to the popular interpretation because the rewards of the persons called "the sheep,"—and the punishment of those called "the goats,"—are made to depend upon their kindness or unkindness to a third class of persons, whom Christ calls his brethren, for which as to the resurrection state we can find no parallel in Scripture. In other parts of Scripture relating to such state, men are reprepresented as being rewarded or punished according to their works generally; but here they are represented as being rewarded or punished according as they have been kind or unkind to a certain class of individuals called Christ's brethren.

If the assembled nations did not know the brethren of Christ to be such, or had not the means of so knowing them, and that something in the same way in which the Egyptians had the means of knowing that God had recognised the Israelites as his people, we do not see how they could deserve commendation or blame, reward or punishment, for treating or not treating them as such. Even those who are censured and condemned are not represented as being ignorant of them as such, from which it may be inferred they knew their relation to the Judge. And they are condemned and punished, not for positive acts of cruelty towards Christ's brethren

Digitized by Google

when in distress, but simply for *neutrality*, or withholding of kindness in the time of extremity. If the prophecy applies to the general judgment of persons raised from the dead, we can find nothing parallel to it in Scripture.

Again—We object to the commonly received interpretation because the prophecy introduces three classes of persons, the "sheep," the "goats," and the "brethren" of Christ; whereas in all other parts of Scripture, which speak of judgment as consequent on the resurrection, only two descriptions of character are mentioned, called sometimes the righteous and the wicked, and at other times the just and the unjust. If the prophecy was intended to represent the judgment of persons raised from the dead, we are unable to account for the introduction into it of this third class of persons, on whom no judgment is pronounced.

Again—We object to the common interpretation because it represents the righteous and the wicked, in their resurrection state, as undergoing a *public trial*, and of reasons being assigned for the reward of the one and the punishment of the other, whereas in other parts of Scripture which speak of such a state we can find no such process stated or reasons assigned.

Again—We object because it represents the wicked, or goats, as seeking to *justify* themselves. They, in answer to the accusation brought against them, are represented as saying, "Lord, when saw we *thee* an hungered or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee." But in no other parts of Scripture, speaking or referring to the resurrection, can we find anything of this self-justification. Here, again, is a strange difference to be accounted for, supposing the prophecy refers to the resurrection state.

Again—We object because neither the righteous nor the wicked, according to this prophecy, are in a position to know whether they shall be acquitted or condemned, rewarded or punished, until the Son of Man comes in his glory. We should be sorry to draw any unfair inference from the common interpretation, but we ask what other construction con be fairly put upon it as to the knowledge referred to on the supposition that this is a post-resurrection scene? The separation, we have no doubt, is an allusion to the custom of the Jews in capital cases, to place those who were to be acquitted on the right hand in the Sanhedrim, and those who were to receive the sentence of condemnation on the left. As soon as a person charged with a criminal offence was placed on the right hand of the Jewish Council he knew he should be acquitted, but not before. And as soon as a person charged with a criminal offence was placed on the left hand of the Council he knew he should be condemned, but not before. If the "nations" to be assembled before the Son of Man, be the dead small and great, righteous and wicked, in one commingled mass, does it not follow that neither of the two classes of persons knows whether they shall be acquitted or condemned

Digitized by Google

until they are separated the one from the other, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, and the Son of Man in allusion to the Jewish custom, places the one on the right hand, and the other on his left? And what does this lead to, but to the conclusion that neither the righteous nor the wicked know whether at the resurrection they shall be acquitted or condemned, rewarded or punished.

Now amid the host of commentators and public teachers who have interpreted this prophecy as a true and particular account of the general resurrection of the just and the unjust, together in a mass, and of the general judgment consequent thereon, if the question were asked them, "Do you believe that the righteous are ignorant whether at the resurrection they shall be condemned or acquitted?" what would be their reply? Their unanimous answer would be, "Most certainly not." And if they were asked, "Why not?" their reply, without a moment's hesistation, would be because they had the witness that they had passed from death unto life. And because, while in the flesh, the righteous dead judged and condemned themselves as lost and ruined sinners, and coming to Christ as such, were justified by faith, and had peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, and had his assurance they should never perish, but should have everlasting life. This is sound reasoning, and perfectly scriptural. And so likewise the rejectors of Christ cannot expect justification in the day of judgment.

Here, then, we are all agreed; and yet we disagree. Why? Because the interpretation of the commentators and teachers referred to is opposed to such an agreement.

The one, it is submitted, is utterly inconsistent with the other, and cannot stand together. Either the argument must be abandoned, or the interpretation given up. Either we must cease to apply the prophecy of the Saviour which speaks of all nations being gathered before him when he sits upon the throne of his glory, to persons raised from their graves, or we must adopt the notion that both the righteous and the wicked are ignorant whether they shall be acquitted or condemned, rewarded or punished, in the judgment. We can see no alternative whatever. Which shall we adopt? To adopt the latter would be to act in direct opposition to the plain and common-sense teaching of the New Testament. And this we can never do. Then we ought to be prepared to give up the former, and to find out an interpretation consistent with the obvious teaching of the prophecy, and in harmony with Scripture teaching generally.

### SUMMARY.

It is now time to sum up what has been said. We have seen that the commonly received interpretation of the last paragraph of Matt. xxv., where the Saviour speaks of his sitting upon the throne of his glory, and gathering before him all nations, and separating

Digitized by Google

them one from the other, is that it is a description of both the righteous and the wicked dead in resurrection life. But to this interpretation we object for the following reasons:

1. Because the prophecy says nothing of the dead or of the resurrection. The persons spoken of are called "nations," and we can find no Scripture in which the dead are called nations.

2. Because we can find no instance in Scripture in which the resurrections of the righteous and wicked dead are represented as taking place together, but on the contrary, we have found several passages in which the resurrection of the just is spoken of as a separate thing, and that without any reference whatever to the resurrection of the unjust.

3. Because the whole of the reward and punishment of the persons called all nations is made to depend, not on their works generally, as in other parts of Scripture, but *entirely* on their kindness or unkindness to a third class of persons whom Christ calls his brethren, whoever they may be.

4. Because in all other parts of Scripture which speak of the resurrection, only two classes of persons are spoken of—the righteous and the wicked; but here, in addition, is a third class, called Christ's brethren.

5. Because the interpretation referred to represents the righteous and the wicked as undergoing a public trial as for life or death, acquittal or condemnation.

Here, then, is a summary list of our objections to this interpretation. And we, as a matter of course, shall be expected to substitute another: and one, too, which shall be free from these objections. This we hope to be able to do in subsequent papers.

## REMARKS.

In conclusion we remark that one thing which has given rise to the interpretation to which our objections apply of the prophecy referred to is the verse with which it closes, which reads thus: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." "But this," says Mr. Darby, "only means that the judgment will be final, like that of the dead. The judgment of the living is as sure as that of the dead." But this must be further considered subsequently.

Again—The real Christian is inwardly, at all events, distinguished from other men in that he has peace and joy in believing. And we lay it down as a first principle that whatever tends to disturb this peace, or damp this joy, goes in the same proportion to obstruct his growth in grace, and to diminish the life of God in his soul. Now this peace and joy in the Lord admit of degrees. Those degrees are in a great measure regulated by the views (not mere speculations), but the believing views we entertain in relation to what God has said to us in his word about the future. Now those who interpret this prophecy as a description of the simul-

Digitized by Google

taneous resurrection and judgment of all mankind have no faith whatever of its taking place till the close of the millennial age. And seeing the multitude of events, according to prophecy, which are to be accomplished preparatory thereto, they calculate that thousands, if not millions, of years must intervene. What is the consequence? Why, because whether the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked is to take place in one commingled mass or otherwise,—whether the righteous are to be separated from the wicked or not,—whether the righteous are to be judged in the sense of having all their sins, transgressions, and iniquities proclaimed and published before an assembled world, or in the sense of simply a judgment of rewards according to their works, is to the interpreters referred to a matter of indifference. At this we are not at all surprised. Why? Because of the immense period of time intervening, as they construe Scripture between the present, and the period of the coming of the Lord, and their resurrection. But let those very persons, as believers in Christ, be only brought to see this subject in another light, the light in which we have put it, then there is not a man amongst them who would not search the Scriptures day and night to see if this be so. And in proportion as they even by possibility are enabled to bring these events near unto them, in the same proportion would they be influenced and comforted thereby, and be taught with joy to be looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God, our Saviour, Jesus Christ. It was in the near prospect of this, by possibility that the Apostle John wrote to all his fellow Christians, 1 John iii. 2: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as he is pure." A. B. C.

---

# THE TREE OF LIFE.

## CONSIDERED AS A SOLUTION OF CURRENT CONTROVERSIES REGARDING IMMORTALITY.

### PART II.

(*Concluded from page* 391.)

WE have answered the How; and we must now, if we dare be so bold, advance to the WHY. *Why* does God, with such promptitude and precaution remove man from the tree of life? We might, not unreasonably, excuse ourselves from entering upon such an arduous inquiry. We are bound to trust God's wisdom and love whether or no we can penetrate the reasons which sustain his interposition. We can believe that this seeming severity is for



Digitized by Google

the best—that there *is* peril (however invisible, unnamable, unimaginable to us), in the risk of premature immortality. Or, again, we might content ourselves with some very general answer, as:—that is not to be wondered at that, seeing that God did not choose to immortalise man in mere blank innocency, he should now decline to immortalise him in sin;—or, that it was a healthy moral development which God desired as the fitting preparation for immortalisation, and, therefore, there seems a divine consistency in this greater stringency resorted to under changed and unpropitious circumstances;—or, that as the spirit of rebellion has invaded this fair province of the divine kingdom, it must be right and may be imperative that this spirit should be confronted with a swift and signal defeat, its next daring and self-willed attempt anticipated and made impossible. With such general considerations as these we might fairly content ourselves. Only by availing ourselves of the whole biblical survey, and by advancing in the way of reverent suggestion, may we venture a step or two further. It is not the expulsion from the garden that perplexes us: it is the perception of the divine dismay revealed in the manner of that expulsion which causes us to think that with the lavish light and help since given, we may succeed in getting a glimpse into the deeper reason of this most wonderful spectacle of divine haste.

We suggest three possible perils involved in man's seizing immortality in his now fallen condition.

A. There is the possible peril of immortalising the psychical, earthy, animal man. Adam was "of the ground, earthy," his soul rather than his spirit dominated his personality. He was not "of heaven," not fit for heaven; not "equal to the angels;"* he was not in the ultimate and perfect physical condition for which God had designed him. *If* (for want of a moral basis on which simultaneously to spiritualise and immortalise him) the immediate eating of the tree would have stunted the very nature of man, "for ever;" would have condemned him to this earth and shut him out of heaven, "for ever;" would have made of him simply an immortal animal man:—this in God's sight, *he* having other, loftier and more loving designs for man, possibly pointing to other worlds and related to his general government of the universe, might well seem, in the eyes of a generous God, to involve a danger of appalling magnitude.

B. There is the possible peril of immortalising sin. Adhering firmly to the biblical notion of immortality, as a condition of the whole undivided man, pre-eminently taking effect on his body, we do not hesitate to suggest a doubt whether it is in the nature of things possible for an immortal man to repent. There is so

* Have we any instance of a creature being *created* immortal. Is not immortality ever the goal—not the starting-point—of creaturely existence?—W. M.

Digitized by Google

much akin to weakness in after-thought and change of mind, that such a doubt seems not to be destitute of some considerable plausibility. One thing is certain—from our point of view:—not an instance of an immortal man's repenting (or sinning) can be produced. We claim the right to doubt the possibility of such a thing. Assume for a moment that the doubt is well grounded: You cannot deny the adequacy of the motive for divine haste. Jehovah mercifully shuts the gate of paradise, because he is determined to keep open the gate of repentance, and because he cannot and will not immortalise human sin.

C. There is the possible peril of making redemption objectively impossible, by taking it out of the power of the woman's seed to bruise the serpent's head. An immortal head means an immortal race. Let man immortalise himself, and then beget sons in his own likeness, immortal too;—and where are you? How then shall the serpent be overcome? Not by suffering, not by death, not by self-sacrifice, not by atonement. Can an immortal man die? Can he die, as Christ died, by the hands of the creature? Can he die as Christ died, to rise again? Can he die otherwise than by such a divinely direct and utter destruction as must put resurrection, salvation, redemption out of the question?—Here, at least, if no where else, we seem to get a glimpse of peril lurking in premature immortality, sufficiently awful to be worthy of the occasion before us—worthy of the broken utterance and instant action of a most merciful God.

*Seventhly*, may we now complete our discussion of this subject by speaking of the tree of life *restored?*

It would appear quite natural that we should, inasmuch as it is a fact that we do again read in the "Revelation" of the tree of life—of its fruit as in store, to be eaten by those who overcome—of its leaves as designed for the healing of the nations—and of the robe-washing which is the condition of entrance into the holy city, and so at the same time the condition of access to that tree. It is therefore true that the idea of a tree of life returns upon us; true that the tree of which we now read is no inaccessible tree.

Only, it is not a mere restoration: on this point it is important to be explicit. We cannot positively say that it is the same tree: perhaps the better way of putting it would be, to say, It is the same divine idea at length realised. In any case, though it be the same tree, it is not found under the same, nor even under very similar conditions. It grows in another soil, and serves more various uses. It is not a mere restoration.

Let us take this opportunity of saying that the great biblical conception of the future is *not* mere restitution.* To

* How glibly men talk "of the restitution of all things." What of Balaam's ass, and the golden calf? The fulfilment "of all things foretold" will be a very different thing from mere restitution. *Of what* will Messiah's



Digitized by Google

a certain extent it is restitution or restoration; but to that notion must be added those contained in the words, enlargement, elevation, development, fulfilment, consummation: in short, the great biblical conception is the perfect realisation of the original divine idea. For example: the entrance of Israel into Canaan was not a mere restoration. Israel left Canaan a family, but returned to it a nation; and Canaan was left behind a strange land, but was re-entered as Israel's own land, given over to them to subdue and to possess. Again: the resurrection of the Lord Jesus was not a mere restoration of life—it was unspeakably more than that. Jesus was crucified in weakness, he was raised in power; he died under law, rose above law; died the victim, rose the high priest; he died a son of Adam the first, he rose himself the Second Adam; he died as he had lived in an earthy, psychical body, he rose in a spiritual, heavenly body—the same body, not merely restored, but spiritualised—the same life, not merely resumed, but consummated. And this leads us to the boldness of affirming that the mere unqualified notion of restitution is wholly opposed to the letter and spirit of God's Word, seeing that it is opposed to and therefore condemned by that profound utterance, "Howbeit that is not first which is spiritual but that which is natural (psychical, soulical): afterward that which is spiritual."

Mere restitution must run in such terms as these: That which is first is spiritual—then the soulical—then finally the spiritual again. Or it must say: First the soulical—then the spiritual—then back to the soulical again. In a word: It must misread the past; or it must misread the future: it must set the old past too high, or it must set the future too low. It must make Adam a heavenly man; or it must make the risen saints of Christ mere earthly men. Restitution pure and simple is no part of God's ways.

And so, returning to our special theme, do we not at once perceive a vast difference between the tree of life of Genesis and the tree of life of the Revelation? The former stood in the rural paradise of man: the latter stands in the metropolitan paradise of God. The former was a reserved tree, biding its time, practically eclipsed by another: the latter stands forth peerlessly prominent, having no fellow, being so to speak all trees in one; and yet that one (in kind) multiplied into a magnificent grove of individual trees lining the banks of the crystal river, and shading the double and ample broadway of the golden city; its fruit, so far from being concealed by its leaves or attracting little notice, is on the contrary expressly celebrated as being produced fresh and fresh—a new yield,

---

kingdom be a restitution? Hence, we cannot admit that, in Acts iii. 21, "restitution" is *the* happy word with which to render ἀποκατάστασις; especially when the prefix (ἀπο) is well satisfied by being taken to call for a fulfilment *answering to*, receiving its form "*from*" the foregoing prophetic word, or still better, the primary divine *ideal*.

Digitized by Google

if not a new variety—every month; and, finally, its very leaves being medicinal, are for the healing of the nations. These very marked differences lie upon the surface of the story. The primary idea of a tree of life is enlarged, ennobled, fulfilled in a most glorious and unlooked-for consummation.

We may not close our treatment of this subject until we have wistfully lingered for a few moments over one suggestive detail already mentioned:—"The leaves of the tree are for the healing of the nations." Then, what are the fruits for? what is the healing intended? and who are the nations?

What are the fruits for? are they not for healing? No! we believe not. They are for the delectation of those who need no healing—for those who have "overcome," the "called and chosen and faithful" who, having fought the good fight of the faith, have once for all laid hold of the age-abiding life, have in fact been raised from the dead immortal, or been changed with an equivalent transformation. No! assuredly the members of Christ will not rise from the dead diseased: not the smallest taint of corruption or tendency to decay and death shall make it needful and render it possible that the leaves of the tree should be applied to THEM. Nothing, I think, can be clearer. It is simply *not the fact* that the saints of God living in this dispensation are looking forward to be medicated by the leaves of the tree. They have never been instructed so to do—quite the contrary. Its fruits they may eat: of this they have the promise.

Next, what is the "healing" intended? We have assumed that it is the removal of corruptibility, the curing of the tendency to decay and death: in short, that what the eating of the fruit was adapted to do in the beginning, *that* the application of the leaves will do at the end. If the Bible is to explain itself, then no other healing can be thought of; for, would it not be misleading to call this tree "the tree of life" at all, if, unlike its name-sake it had nothing to do in the work of causing to "live for ever?" And yet, as we have seen, the special immortalising virtue is not in the fruit; and therefore, following the only clue we have, we are compelled to find that virtue in the leaves, and say: This healing is a healing that immortalises, that causes to live for ever; and so this healing is precisely that which gives to the tree its distinctive name. And does not such a transfer of the immortalising virtue from the fruit to the mere leaves exactly agree with what we just now showed to be the Bible idea of restoration; namely, restoration with advancement; not an abandonment of the original purpose, but the carrying it forward to a higher realisation? This final tree of life, coming into view in this crowning revelation of God's purposes, is a marvellously simple, beautiful, eloquent embodiment of glorified restitution, the long-delayed promise of first beginnings at length exceeded by all the distance between earth and heaven.

And who then are "the nations?" The age to come will reveal

Digitized by Google

them. One thing is certain, nay, two are undeniable—they are not the church; they are not Israel. "The nations" are neither the body of the Lord, nor are they the bride of the Lamb. The church is an election or a selection of individuals out of the nations, including individuals of the Hebrew people. Even if we should, instead of "the nations," translate "the gentiles," we must still discriminate between "the gentiles" and "Israel"—leaving an "Israel" not needing to be healed by the leaves. However, this softening of "the nations" into "the gentiles" is not a very probable suggestion in this case, inasmuch as these *ethnee* have plain marks of full and proper nationality:—they dwell on the new earth, rather than in the holy city; they walk in the light of the city; they have kings who reign over them and carry their glory and honour within the pearly gates. Which last considerations, by the way, conduct us to the assurance that these nations lie outside even the innumerable multitude of chapter seven; seeing that that multitude, however great, is not a multitude of nations, but distinctly of individuals taken out of the nations, and their permanent abode—instead of being on the new earth, outside the city, where "the nations" walk (as if at a distance) in the light of the city—is *before the throne, serving God day and night in his temple!* This conclusion must appear beyond dispute to those who can with assurance trace the preparation of these nations to the millennial period. What more obvious than that these should say, "The 'innumerable multitude,' and 'the nations' the *same?* No! how can they be? The 'multitude' 'come out of *the great tribulation;*' but you surely do not mean to say that Messiah's reign on earth will be a time of great tribulation? Why, 'in *his* days shall the righteous flourish and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth:' you do not call THAT 'great tribulation?'"

The great widening of our hope, therefore, here receives a positive divine sanction—a sanction be it observed for which some earlier intimations of the New Testament prepare us, such as—that Christ's church, his body, is to be employed by him in filling all things (Eph. i. 23); that we have approached unto "an assembly of firstborn-ones," suggesting a still larger circle of later-born children of God (Heb. xii. 23); and that we have been begotten by God as "a kind of first-fruit of his creatures," intimating a kind of harvest of his creatures subsequently gathered in (Jas. i. 18). It is perhaps undesirable that we should press the question: Whence are these nations to come? although, to many, it would appear sufficiently obvious to say that a thousand years' good government of this earth by Christ Jesus our Lord and his risen saints may surely be expected to yield a harvest of sanctified though not yet immortalised nations; and that, as at all events one nation is to be, if not born in a DAY, yet at least speedily brought to the birth, an imposing assemblage of nations may be born within the compass of ten centuries; which assemblage of nations,

Digitized by Google

even when weeded by the final apostasy under Gog and Magog, may furnish no unworthy quota for the peopling of the new earth. We say we will not press the question,—Whence do these nations come? although many, no doubt, feel eager to bring in the solemn thought of the mighty nations of the dead: the keen inquiry, are these all lost? the critical distinction that, although not fitted to rise already spiritual and immortal, yet that is no reason why they should not rise with a psychical life, permitting them to hear the joyful message they never heard before, and susceptible of being heightened into a christianly sanctified, and then (by the very leaves of the tree) still further into an immortal life. We repeat once more: On principle, we refrain from insisting on the mere question of "whence come they." We purposely *broach* it, because we are persuaded the Bible has far-reaching suggestions to offer in reply; because some of the noblest of instincts impel men to ponder those suggestions; because it is puerile and wrong to think of forbidding so natural an inquiry. Yet, for our part, we are mistrustful of our preparedness for a true and wise answer. We do not wish to frame or fancy too wide a door of hope: we are afraid of imagining one so narrow as to exclude some of the "families of the earth" whom God has not excluded. *And besides*, though we scarcely expect at present to arrive at a determination of this question, yet we need not be idle. Here, for instance, is a divinely furnished hint. Let us take it, ponder it; apply it all round, as a safe check on every hypothesis. It is this—coming in appropriately as an apocalyptic beatitude:—"Happy they who wash their robes [so all the ancient codices] that theirs may be the right to the tree of life, and that they may enter through the gates into the city." (Rev. xxii. 14.) Beautiful words! Exquisite discriminations! Most evangelical yet not antinomian principles. On the one hand these robes are not the personal righteousness of Christ, which certainly needs no washing; but represent individual character, the outward man viewed as an adornment of the inward. "The nations" are nations of pure men. But then, on the other hand, the nations once were not pure; for, see! their robes have been *washed*—we know in what laver: no pagan fount, no pool of mere dark sincerity; but (chap. vii. 14) "in the blood of the Lamb,"—whom, therefore, somewhere, somehow, they have come savingly to know, to trust, and to adore. And so, not otherwise than through "the knowledge of him"—Jehovah's "righteous servant"—will declare righteous even these wide-lying and late-coming "nations" have solved the question of "good and evil," and found their way to the tree of life. We have no need to be ashamed of a hope as wide and firm as this; having outlines divinely traced and foundations divinely laid; and which is ready to give, as its meek and reverent reason, the word and name and sacrifice of him who is at once the seed of the woman, the archetype of man, and the image of God.

Digitized by Google

## CONCLUSION.

Our opening anticipation has been abundantly realised. The Scripture doctrine of the tree of life is neither more nor less than the doctrine of Conditional Immortality. Immortality is conditioned at the beginning in Genesis: it is conditioned at the end in the Revelation.

In the first dispensation the one tree conditioned the other. The unreserved recognition of this significant fact sets us on the right track for pursuing the whole subject. It gives us a clear and simple notion of what the basis of immortality really is. It is not probation; but training. God designs to immortalise; but he designs to educate for immortality. And this design he never abandons. He pursues it through every dispensation of his mercy, in his dealings with all the nations of the earth, in his providence over every soul of man. He pursues it pre-eminently in all that concerns the coming of the woman's seed and the bruising of the serpent's head. No wonder that when the moral development has taken a perverse turn, the discipline takes a severer form. But the intention of the culture outside paradise is the very same as of that begun within it—it is to qualify for immortality. And it is just because of this unbroken continuity in the ultimate principle of all God's dealings with man, that two dispensations so diverse as that before the fall and that after are seen to dovetail accurately into each other. Behind the cherubic guard the tree of life still for awhile stands, because the destiny it symbolises is only postponed. It stands till the mercy-seat be erected, and sacrificial blood be shed, and the line of the victorious seed be traced; so that ere the hope of immortality as obtainable in one way is extinguished, it is fanned to an ardent flame by the ripening provision of it in another. We therefore repeat our conclusion: God designs to make man immortal on condition that man be divinely trained and become divinely fitted to possess the unspeakable gift. Let us submit this conclusion to a final and crucial test. Of the Son of Man we cannot say that he was put on probation; but we can most scripturally affirm that even he was trained for immortality. He learned obedience by the things that he suffered. He poured out his soul unto death. He was perfected. When perfected, he was invested with the power of an indissoluble life. He rose immortal. Death had lordship over him no more. But here, transfixed, we gaze. What, pray, is this great sight which now we behold? It is, *at length*, "the IMAGE of God." Ah! now we have it! Adam was created (בצלם) "as the shadow of God."* His flesh was a vail—a tent—a house of clay. The measure of divine glory it

* The word properly means "shade" or "shadow;" hence also "vain show," "illusion." (Ps. xxxix. 6; lxxiii. 20.) "The fundamental signification is *to cover, to veil.*" (Fürst.) For "as," representing *beth essentiæ*, see Gesenius' Heb. Gram. p. 328, *a*, γ.

Digitized by Google

contained, it in part concealed. Adam was the shadowy sketch of God: at most a *skia-graphia*, "a painting in light and shade (without colours)." Nevertheless, he was at the same time created (-כ) *after, according to, in the direction of,* "the likeness of God"—a likeness, indeed, visible in the outline of shade (Gen. v. 1); but designed, by filling in and colouring, to become a perfect image.* Here, in three words—"shadow," "likeness," "image"—you have the start and course and goal of normal human development. Had Adam loyally followed it, the vail of his flesh, without being rent, would in due time have become transparent—the translucent temple of indwelling Deity. He did not follow it; and we must pass over to his Antitype, Man's second Head. He too at first took on him this human shade of God, this soul-body fashioned of dark earth; but, passing into the fire of self-sacrifice, he soon re-appeared, to those who could behold him; and lo! the vail was a vail no more—it had been transformed into living crystal, revealing the fulness of the Godhead. This is the realised ideal: this the eternally designed, the ultimately perfected, and therefore the finally immortalised image of God.

* JOSEPH B. ROTHERHAM.

---

## FEED MY SHEEP.

JOHN xxi. 15-17.

THERE are three divisions under which our remarks on these three words may be arranged; (1) "*sheep;*" (2) "*my* sheep;" (3) "*Feed* my sheep."

I. *Sheep.* Of all animals sheep are least fitted to typify the natural man. *His* characteristics are self-will, impatience of control, contempt of leadership, and a mighty self-confidence.

The sheep, in regard to self-will, seems to have none. One of a flock leaping a hedge by chance, is recognised by the others as a noble leader having miraculously a will of his own; and straightway they all follow him one by one—into the ditch! Hence their only wisdom is in following the shepherd. He has a personal interest in their safety, and will, until the day when he sells them for slaughter, guard them from the wolf; risking his life, not for the sheep, but for his pocket's sake,—for the wolf does not pay for what he eats,—and he will lead them where they may get fatter, so as to weigh heavier in the scales.

The sheep is a beautiful type of the follower of Christ. Self-will *in him* has become "the will of my Father which is in heaven." Self-

---

* Even the *Septuagint*, though it completely wipes out the climax seen in the Hebrew of Gen. i. 26, does not say *in*, but only *according to*, or *after* (κατά) the image (εἰκων). The A.V. is an anti-climax, and surely very misleading.

Digitized by Google

confidence has become the humblest distrust in self, and the proudest faith in God. Self-reliance has become absolute dependence.

But yet strength of will is not annihilated; on the contrary it is in its highest exercise. "If any man will follow me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." To deny oneself requires the strongest exercise of the will, and just as the highest art shows itself in the disappearance of art, so the strongest exercise of the will produces the disappearance of will; and nothing so well sets forth the powerful determinations of the sons of God as the act of the silly, helpless, and confiding sheep. "I know whom I have believed." "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him." "When thou wast young," said Christ to Peter, "thou girdedst thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldest, but when thou shalt be old (well trained in following me) thou shalt stretch forth thine hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not;" i.e., "wouldest not" naturally: for neither was Peter's life taken from him, but he laid it down of himself—for the sake of him who said, "Follow me."

2. "*My* sheep." Mine by creation. "By him were all things made that were made; both visible and invisible." Mine by purchase: "Feed the flock of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." A greater price he could not pay, it was the measure of his love,—at least the most of that love that he could express to us.

We know that many would confine the application of these terms to the very few comparatively, who in every age distinguish themselves among the rest of mankind as the devoted followers of Christ. "My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me."

These are truly Christ's sheep. They love the shepherd and know that he gave himself for them. But the work of the apostles was not to stay at Jerusalem nourishing the small church there gathered. They were sent into all the world, because Christ himself said: "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and there shall be one flock and one shepherd." Before then the sheep have heard, therefore, and before they follow, they are Christ's sheep. They are his before he brings them; when they are out in the wilderness, unfolded. He died for generations yet unborn, who should hereafter be told that he died for them; and they were Christ's sheep before they drew their first breath, and through all their sinful wilful careers, before they merged their self-will in the voluntary service begotten by the Spirit of Christ.

Since we are told that "God so loved the world;" and that Christ is "the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe;" I would say that by "my sheep" Jesus Christ meant Peter to understand mankind in no smaller sense than that in which he himself understood his ministry,—wherever you find men wanting the bread of life, you must impart it. There you have found "my sheep." There you may—there you ought—there you must feed them—even as I have fed you.

3. "*Feed* my sheep." They are to be fed because Christ is the King of the race, and while he claims right of kingship over all men, excepting none, he accepts all the duties and obligations of kingship. England, because she is Christian, acknowledges her duty to feed her perishing subjects, and does not God? Yes, verily; all men must have the heavenly food offered them, even if any should finally refuse it.

Digitized by Google

When a slave master redeemed a slave he absolved himself from all obligation to support him. But Christ purchased that he might redeem, and redeemed that he might keep. Having bought his slave, he sets him free, and says, "Follow me." The freedman declares himself a slave, and follows and sups with his master. Now observe :—

The Roman master of slaves bought his fifty or more in the market and out of the lot selected two or three for his house. Only comeliness of form or age recommended the house slave—the characters of each being as yet unknown. Years pass. The rest of the gang are working in the fields, the factory, or the mine. The master passes them by, talking with a friend. They stop, they point,—"There is the danger to the state." The outbreak of a servile war, to be postponed only by hedging off the masses still further from the civilisation of the free men, and brutalising them still more by severities of toil and iniquities of injustice. To crush the manhood out of them is the duty and the safety of the state. The master may or may not notice that some are feeble, aged, wounded, sickly; and some are missing. But while he talks there comes to him from his villa, his house-slave, comely, well-fed, intelligent,—his master's prize, to whom he can and does confide everything. The calm judgment of this domestic has made his fields to prosper, and with inflexible integrity he has amassed him wealth. To his friend that master points him out, praises his many excellent qualities, and testifies his intention of giving this chattel his freedom and to endow him with part of his fortune. In fact he had saved his master's life as well as made his fortune.

And whence this difference ? The house-slave was one of the elect—elected from the mass in the slave-market—elected from the "purchased possession." To his election he owed his privileges, to his privileges his growth into a noble character, and finally his redemption.

But suppose the master's choice had fallen upon some other than *he*, and this house steward had been left to sweat under the lash of the gang driver, in the fields or in the mine ? The character would not have developed, nor the happiness been enjoyed, but all the capacities for that character and that happiness had been there, crushed under a fearful fate. Now it is the lot of the mass, of the gang of men, to be denied God's election, God's house here. But "he knoweth what is in man." The Roman slave-owner could only know after the slave had come into his house, but we should remember *all men dwell in the house of God*, in the sense that he knows them more intimately than we do our domestic servants.

Next observe :—

It is only in feeding the sheep that we get to love them as we should. They are little to us until by caring for their wants and satisfying them, we come to be interested in them. Think how it is with us and our children. However much we may genuinely feel towards the crowded Sunday-school, how different the feeling when we recognise our own amongst the crowd.

Now this is not simply because they are our own. I have known a servant girl who got to love her master's child more than her own baby at home, because she fed the one and not the other. She saw daily before her eyes the winning ways, she heard the needy cry, she was

Digitized by Google

rewarded by the satisfied smile of the child—not her own; while her own—because she no longer ministered to its wants, dropped out of her affections. Christ gives us this command in order that we may learn to love our fellow creatures even as he does. There are lovable things in them but we cannot find them out except we feed them.

And with what must we feed them?

In the large sense, the doing of any kind of real good to man is a fulfilment of this command, "Feed my sheep;" but specially the food is *divine truth*,—a large answer by which I would chiefly mean the truth concerning our Lord as the Good Shepherd giving his life for the sheep, and our duty to follow him and diligently to hearken to his voice. What other food can give life to the soul? And since the sheep require feeding, let us remember there are αρνια, lambs, and προβατα, sheep, and προβατια, dear feeble sheep, to be fed, and with what discretion as well as love it should be done. Moreover, since our bodies require that food should be administered at recurring intervals (man not being constituted like the boa-constrictor which will swallow an antelope and fast for a month), and our minds and souls are similarly constituted relatively to their appropriate nourishment—the feeding with divine truth should take place at intervals divided by secular pursuits. The law of intromission is necessary alike to appetite and assimilation. Hence the wisdom of the seventh day for worship and rest, of night and morning, of missions and revivals, and also, however blessed their results, the wisdom of stopping the missions and revivals after a time, and allowing a long interval before their resumption. The sheep are to be fed *periodically*.

And who is to feed them?

It is the bounden duty of all Christians who themselves know the truth to tell it to others that they may be fed thereby. This office is not confined to those whom God has placed in his Church as evangelists, prophets, and teachers, but is incumbent upon all who after hearing the Good Shepherd say, Follow me! can repeat the call to his fellow men. Lift up your eyes, my readers, and behold the flock! You shrink from many, they are so forbidding, torn, filthy blood-gouts of the wolf upon them. They were not born so; but the wolf and the wilderness awaited them when born. These you might pity, wash, and feed. A nearer inspection would discover that hidden behind the defiled exterior the fleece is soft and clean. What you do to them will be done to him who calls them his.

And those others—fair-seeming at a distance, but nearer found to be cursed with all manner of pride and perversity; who live and move and have their being in all the ways of contradiction, opposition, depreciation, and blame-giving by which their wretched selves may be exalted, and the innocent and worthy may be saddened and brought low. People whose track through life is marked by bruised spirits, broken hearts, and blighted households. It is impossible to love these for their own sakes, but as the orphan children of a man who died in the public service are cared for, whatever their character may be, for their father's sake, so should we, for Christ's sake, feed even the most forbidding of his sheep.

They may be wholly without a touch that draws us, it may be their deformities even disgust us; but remembering what evils have been

Digitized by Google

strewn in the long current of men's blood, and that Christ stood in that current, flowing from Adam down to the last man, in order that by shedding his own into it, its virus might be cured, we can, remembering this, see Christ's sheep in the most diseased and misshapen of our kind. And when self-denying love has done its work, long sympathy with the Master fastens his very image before our eyes, so that when we next look on that which, though deformed, is Christ's, we can see little else than the vision of the King in his beauty.

As the feeblest child in a family gets most love because it receives most care, so in proportion to your care will your love grow, and your love will renew your care. The sheep are left to wander, not in carelessness, but with regard to the cultivation in Christ's own first-called, of such sentiments towards them as only self-denying ministry can produce. Let us, then, hear at morn, at noon, at evening, and at midnight, these words of Christ, "Feed my sheep," and after hearing them, follow him who gave himself for the life of the world.

* HENRY DEACON.

---

# THE DOGMA OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION, IS IT OF MAN OR OF GOD?

## BY GENERAL GOODWYN.

(*Concluded from page* 396.)

VIII. REGARDING this interval that occurs between the righteous execution of the wrath of God on an antichristian world of living apostates, closing the age of the above-mentioned ἐκκλησία history, and the last judgment on the unredeemed, I desire to record a further explanatory testimony. In the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, ver. 13-17, is an epitome of the divine object, for the attainment of which the kingdom of the Son of Man will be established for a thousand years. I say epitome of the *object*, for it is not my purpose here to enter into the judicial character of the administration by which that object will be effected;* it is sufficient to refer to 2 Tim. iv. 1, where it is said that "The Lord Jesus Christ will judge the living and the dead AT HIS APPEARING AND HIS KINGDOM." Reverting to Acts xv., there is a statement first of all of the salvation of Gentiles during this present age; "at the first" (ver. xiv.), i.e., the first period after the resurrection of Christ. After this dispensational interval, it is affirmed of the Lord that he "WILL RETURN!" The primary object to be effected at his return is then declared (ver. 16) to be the restoration and salvation of the house and throne of David (Zech. xii., xiii. 1; Rom. xi. 25-26; Rev. vii. 1-8, &c.); afterwards we are informed of the purpose of this resuscitation of Israel, it is "THAT THE RESIDUE OF MEN UPON WHOM THE NAME OF THE LORD IS CALLED" may learn to know him and be saved

---

* Full details in my work on "The Book of the Revelation." Chap. 11, pp. 307-327. (Elliot Stock.)

Digitized by Google

(see ver. 18 in connection). As a "Kingdom of priests," the nation will be employed by the King to fulfil the mission which in their earlier days they failed to perform, viz., to live in faithfulness and obedience to Jehovah, so as to be an attractive centre for surrounding nations to worship the true God. When reinstated and restored (Ezek. xxxvi., xxxvii.), with Jesus their "King of Glory" (Ps. xxiv.), and Jerusalem rebuilt in magnificence and power (Isa. lx.), they shall bring the nations of the earth to the obedience of the sceptre of their Messiah. The glad tidings of salvation shall be proclaimed by a redeemed nation. The Lord himself "shall make bare his holy arm in the eyes of all nations" of the millennial earth, and "all the ends of the earth SHALL SEE the salvation of Israel's God" (Isa. lii. 7-10); which prophet in another place says, "He shall cause them that come of Jacob to take root; Israel shall blossom and bud, AND FILL THE FACE OF THE WORLD WITH FRUIT" (Isa. xxvii. 6). This "fruit," the sequence of the salvation of Israel, is brought to light in Rev. vii. 9-11, under the same "seal of the living God," as the twelve tribes, an innumerable multitude out "of all nations, kindreds, people, and tongues," standing in righteousness as with a garment before the millennial throne. The second chapter of Isaiah, vers. 1-3 with 20, tells the same joyous tale, and proclaims in harmony the fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise, "In thee and thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Be it moreover remarked that these masses of the human race are *all saved previous to* the manisfestation of the great white throne of final reward.

Surely then in the above numbers there are sufficient for the fulfilment of those Scriptures that by Universalist teachers are *supposed* to bear upon future forgiveness at some uncertain future time; sufficient to justify the revelation of God, both in regard to the final cause of the Incarnation of his Son for the salvation of his foreordained family, as well as his determination to abolish both sin and sinners (Rom. viii. 2; Heb. ix. 26); and that without perversion of those Divine records that unambiguously pronounce the *irreversible* doom of such *wilfully* and *incorrigibly* wicked men as are righteously deemed "worthy of the second death." For them "there remaineth *no more sacrifice* for sins, but *a certain* fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation which SHALL DEVOUR the adversaries." (Heb. x. 26, 27.)

IX. If the case be as I have supposed it; or if so, apart even from the erroneous opinion regarding the several *periods* of Divine judicial action on mankind, it would seem that the adoption of Universalist views has been without preconsideration of the principles of ordinary human jurisprudence, notwithstanding their Divine source. Would it be Godlike, when once the sentence of "everlasting destruction *from the presence of the Lord*," and eternal prohibition from any participation in his glory (2 Thess. i. 9) has been passed, righteously because of well substantiated atheistical guilt and obdurate rejection of mercy; would it be consistent with the character of God, I repeat, to revoke that sentence, violate the majesty of the law, trample on the acknowledged principle of human responsibility, and sacrifice a Divine attribute of righteousness to another attribute of mercy? Would not such a revocation be unjust in the eyes of intelligent beings both in heaven and earth, an acquittal of men who, "*knowing the judgment of God*," "their con-

Digitized by Google

science bearing witness in their accusation," have been infallibly pronounced to be WITHOUT EXCUSE? Would it not be a denial of the word of God which, whilst declarative of "mercy for thousands, of forgiveness of iniquity, transgression, and sin," most emphatically predicates that God will BY NO MEANS clear the guilty? Would it be just to God's well beloved Son, whose sacrifice was for the taking away of the sin of the world, and who would have embraced all sinners in its power, to declare forgiveness to such as trample him under foot, counting his blood an unholy thing, and who maglignantly despise the spirit of grace? (Heb. x.)

Salvation is pronounced to be "an election of grace," which it is not if salvation is to be common to all! But if an election *of grace*, it is nevertheless observant of the principle of *human responsibility*. If God in the exercise of foreknowledge has "ordained many unto eternal life," it is "*as many who believed*." It was only to "*as many as received him*" that the Son of God "gave the privilege of becoming sons of God!" I am aware of the statement concerning the Divine *will* that all men should be saved. He has expressed his *willingness* for their salvation in that his Son "Jesus Christ gave himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. ii. 4-6), but is it his *decree*, if that "one mediator between God and men" is repudiated with all the accessories of *purposed* recusancy and virulent denial? It is further said that "God gave his only begotten Son in love to *the world;* but it is added that the gift was in order that "*whosoever believeth* on him might not perish." That the world "*might be* saved" is true, but the world asserting its prerogative at the bidding of the devil gave proof that it would not by the murder of "the Prince of Life!" whilst, therefore, those who are saved are taken "*out of the world*" (John xvii. 6-14), the world itself "lieth in the wicked one," and will perish with him, its god and prince. *Every* party that I have *purposely* referred to as about to be saved—and who will say that the aggregate is not innumerable?—is one *gathered out from a mass* upon the above method of procedure; there are those that "perish," to whom "the cross of Christ is foolishness," but to those who are saved "it is the power of God;" to the former it is "a savour of death unto death," death temporal unto death eternal. Is that a mere dead letter, a mockery? God forbid! Life eternal is the knowledge of God and his Son Jesus Christ, and is the gift of the Father "to *as many*" as have been given of the Father to the Son. Again, "The righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, is unto all, but (only) *upon all who believe*." (Rom. iii. 22.) These statements are decisive and irreversible, even if there were not such unanswerable condemnation of the wicked as that contained in 2 Peter ii. 9-12, the Epistle of Jude, and in the fire that shall come down from heaven and DEVOUR the irrepressible nations Satan-led to the act of lawless and damnable rebellion against the person and government of Jesus the Lord! Such an act will be confirmatory of the impossibility of the reformation of human nature intrinsically corrupt. A nature that during his reign on earth will have had the influence of the benign, the morally excellent, the all-powerful and blessed administration of the Son of God in person; together with the reiterated message of reconciliation proclaimed by an entire nation redeemed from the most bitter experiences of lawlessness and evil (Isa. liv.) under more glorious and impressively solemn evidences

Digitized by Google

of the love, grace, manifold wisdom, and creative power of the Godhead than will ever have been known on earth before! Will not this be proof powerfully enough brought to bear upon *human* nature for its condemnation? Will there not have been forbearance enough on the part of the Almighty to justify the *full accomplishment* of his determination uttered of old, though at that time only partially carried out? "And the Lord said I WILL DESTROY man whom I have created from the face of the earth;" and again, "THE END OF ALL FLESH is come before Me, for the earth is filled with violence through them." This DESTRUCTION and FIRE-DEVOURING of "*the end* of *all* flesh," will terminate the righteous judgment of the quick or living men on earth, and give place to the establishment of the great white throne, from which will issue the *irrevocable* sentence on the wilfully wicked, "great and small," who will have died the first death, a sentence that consigns them to "the second death," from which there is not the faintest tittle of evidence that there shall ever be a resurrection!

X. It remains for me, in conclusion, to endeavour to show that the passage—the only one to which but *a shadow* of probability of future restoration attaches—of the third chapter of 1 Peter regarding the *supposed* preaching of Christ to certain "spirits in prison," could not have occurred. Mr. Maude, in a late periodical called *Sunday Morning* (June, 1872), has brought it forward with a declaration that "it establishes for ever the possibility of forgiveness after death." He has been careful first of all to denounce as a "Puritan gloss" the very interpretation that is consistent either with the language used, the analogy of Scripture in reference to the existence of disembodied spirits, and the facts recorded of the Lord Jesus Christ after his death. It is an easy thing to *say* that an opposite method "has been abandoned by all sound critics;" some may have been found to support Mr. Maude's opinion, but not "*all*" are like-minded, and notwithstanding the ingenuity of the criticism of the passage, the words of the Apostle yet stand forth in the power of their original simplicity for the illustration of the object in view, viz., a testimony to those to whom Peter wrote—Jews principally, as the Apostle of the Circumcision—of *promised* deliverance by the power of the Spirit of Christ not corporeally present. The "figure" used by the Apostle was the testimony of Noah in whose time "the long suffering of God waited," though only "while the ark was preparing," as it does now with national Israel; the result would be the same. Mr. Maude asserts that "Christ went in the condition of a spirit, in the interval between his death and resurrection, to certain spirits in prison. That his gracious object was the salvation of those to whom he preached the Gospel, *notwithstanding the fact that they had perished under Divine judgment.*" (Italics mine.) In the first place these imaginary spirits could only have been those of men who had died the *first* death; if therefore the forgiveness of such is determined, what need for any mention of a *second* death, to the nature of which I have alluded above? It is surely either superfluous, or there will be a partial, and consequently unjust consignment of *some*, deprived of the after privilege, to perdition, and *some* to forgiveness, when *all* will be under *the same* condemnation.

Again, in regard to the supposed disembodied condition of Christ "in

Digitized by Google

the interval between death and resurrection," the fortieth verse of Matthew xii. will at once dissolve the idea. It is there said that "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, *so* shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." The case of the *living* Jonah is cited, corporeally perfect; *as* therefore he was thus buried in the fish, *so* was the Son of Man buried in the earth! The entire Son of Man, body and soul according to Ps. xvi. 10, and according to Isa. liii. 12, where it is related that "He poured out *his soul unto death*," but whose spirit, the only remaining constituent part, was committed to his Father. (Luke xxiii. 46.)* There could not possibly therefore have been any disembodiment during those three days and nights. Much too might be added concerning the character of the place to which it is erroneously *supposed* Christ went. Hades is not mentioned, but if it is imagined, it is a place where "there is no remembrance of God;" a place where there is "the silence of the grave;" a place where "the dead *know not any thing*, neither have they any more a reward, for their memory is forgotten."

But let it be granted—merely by way of disproof—that Christ did preach the Gospel to such spirits; does experience warrant the conclusion that the spirits were then obedient and were, or were to be, forgiven thereby? Have we not unquestionable evidence that the preaching of Christ in the world was attended by the smallest results? does he not say so himself in the parable of the Sower of the Seed? (Matt. xiii.)† Are we then to consider the possibility of any greater results in the orthodox (?) Hades than there were on earth? If not, then the majority of these spirits would be unsaved still, and thus falls the dogma of *universal* salvation!

Finally, let us listen to a "sound critic" on this passage, which I will here abbreviate. Bishop Leighton in his commentary on the Epistles of Peter, gives that faithful interpretation that proceeds from no mental bias, but is analogous to the tenets of the Word of God. He states that "there are two points for consideration, *apart from* the application that follows in vers. 21, 22. (1) An assertion concerning the preaching of Christ and the objects he preached to. (2) A description of *the period* or age wherein that preaching occurred, and the particular way of God, dealing with the people of that age. These two points taken together state 'By which Spirit he (Christ) went and preached to *the spirits in prison*' (mark! *not* that *were* in prison as the popular idea is); 'which sometime were disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited *in the days of Noah while the ark was preparing*, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water.'"

"This same Apostle (1 Peter i. 10, 11) declares 'The Spirit of Christ to have testified beforehand, through the prophets,' of 'the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.' Now Noah was a preacher of

* That the soul is as material a part of man as his body, has been proved ably by Professor Bain, "Mind and Body, the Theories of their Relation;" a work that simply attests the doctrine of Scripture, as I have shewn in a little pamphlet called "Holoklēria." (E. Stock.)

† Divinely ordained so; for the Holy Spirit was to supplement the work of the Son, by the testimony of the resurrection and *acceptance* in heaven of the ransom for sinners.



Digitized by Google

righteousness (2 Peter ii. 5), and received from God the power of the same Spirit *prophetically* to warn the disobedient of the impending flood. But inasmuch as the Second Person is, and always has been the manifested activity of the Godhead and source of all ministry, it was the Spirit of him foreknown as the Christ (Messiah), that spoke in Noah—just as he spoke in the above-mentioned prophets afterwards—the words of righteous warning concerning judgment at hand." This interpretation is confirmed by the consideration of the Divine declaration in Gen. vi. 3, "My Spirit shall not always strive with men, but their days shall be a hundred and twenty years." That is to say, his Spirit should strive in the testimony of Noah during a hundred and twenty years, or as Peter says, "while the ark was preparing," and no longer.

The Bishop proceeds, "In regard to the persons preached to, there are two things by which they are characterised. Their *present* condition when the Apostle was writing 'spirits in prison;' and their *former* condition when the Spirit of Christ in Noah was preaching to them, 'sometime disobedient.' The latter was first in time. The Greek word translated 'sometime disobedient,' is ἀπειθήσασι, 'they were not persuaded' when in the flesh, therefore are they *now* 'spirits in prison.' The spirits of those men are now 'in prison (φυλακη, *not* ἁδης), a place of ward in the safe keeping* of God, where the spirits of all other men are who have died (Eccles. vii. 7), to be rejoined to their bodies respectively at the resurrections. (Heb. xii. 23; Acts vii. 59)."

My Christian brethren to whom I write, remember that thus saith the Lord, "Believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits whether they be of God."

---

## THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

STANDING on his defence before Felix, Paul avowed that he had "hope toward God that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." (Acts xxiv. 15.) Every attentive reader of the Bible must have observed that this hope of the apostle has great prominence given to it in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, especially in the latter. "The hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his [the Son of God's] voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of condemnation," are the words of the true and faithful Witness, who is also the Judge of the living and the dead. The resurrection is the time of award to the faithful, and punishment to the faithless, who are asleep in the dust of the earth when the Lord returns from heaven.

This truth has often been set forth and illustrated in these pages; and our present purpose is, mainly, (1) to call attention to the fact that the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust, occupies a very prominent place in the Holy Scriptures; and (2) to call attention to the place this same truth has in modern theology. We should rather say,

---

* See use of this word in Matt. xiv. 10, xviii. 30; Acts xii. 4, 5, &c.

Digitized by Google

the *absence* of this truth in modern theology. For while *resurrection* may often be alluded to, the resurrection of THE DEAD is ignored, or denied, by common consent. Of the truth of this statement, abundant evidence has appeared in the RAINBOW. We refer especially to the series of elaborate papers on "The Resurrection of the Dead," in last year's issue, from March to December. In these papers various theories of resurrection are expounded and discussed; and "the Rationale" of the doctrine attempted to be determined, with what success the attentive reader will determine for himself. What we refer to these papers for is to call attention to the fact that the various theories discussed relate not to the resurrection of *the dead*, but to the resurrection of those who have been *continuously alive*. The accuracy of this statement the reader can verify for himself.

Meanwhile we proceed to show that *the resurrection of the dead* holds no place in the current theology of the day. True, indeed, the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism teaches "the resurrection of the body"—language nowhere found in Scripture: what Paul had hope toward God for was "the resurrection of the dead ones"—dead persons (*των νεκρων*). The soul is held to be the man—the body, but the house in which the man resides; and the Shorter Catechism teaches that "the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory," and it is only their bodies that do "rest in their graves till the resurrection." No wonder, then, that so little account is made of the resurrection as the time of reward in the orthodox preaching and teaching of the day. If the soul of the believer—which is, indeed, the believer himself, is at death made perfect in holiness, and immediately passes into glory, the resurrection of his body must be a matter of comparatively little consequence to him.

But there is a great and growing number claiming to be Christians who deny that there shall be a resurrection of the body. (See RAINBOW for 1877, page 271.) They hold that when the present body dies, the spirit disengages itself from its mortal habitation for a spiritual and purer frame; "stands up in a world of spiritual beings, when this weary, wasted, worn-out form is laid aside in death." That "the soul in dying drops this shell, this husk of the body that is to be, and which is *done with for ever*, and is clothed upon with a form which gives it freedom of range through the spiritual sphere."

Another theory, which, to our thinking, differs but slightly from that just indicated, is, in the case of believers, the spiritual body is elaborated by the action of the quickened *pneuma* through the soul upon the body by means of the nerve-aura, or fluid, which envelopes the nerves, and by the aid of which the motion of their molecules communicates sensations and transmits the mandates of the will, in the life that now is. Scripture, it is confessed, "gives us, indeed, but little help in this matter;" and that, if challenged "to prove it from the Bible," inability to do so is frankly acknowledged; yet, notwithstanding, the speculation is maintained, as the bridge over the difficulties surrounding the resurrection. (See RAINBOW for 1877, p. 475.)

We refer to these various theories to show that they all treat, not of the resurrection of the dead, but of the living. According to each and all of them:—



Digitized by Google

"There is no death, what seems so is transition."

That which, in Scripture, is uniformly spoken of as a sore evil, yea, the very penalty of sin, is nothing else than the gate of bliss—the door of heaven.

Viewed as a bridge over the difficulties of our ignorance as to how the dead of past ages are to stand alive again in their own proper persons, and receive award according to their deeds in the present life, it may help some minds to conceive it to be a credible thing that God should raise the dead, or those we say are dead; but to us it seems a most incredible thing that the apostle Paul believed in such continuous living when he wrote the fifteenth chapter of his first letter to the church at Corinth. There we find that there were some among them who said there was "no resurrection of the dead;" and, from the objections put into their mouths by the apostle in verse 35, "How are the dead raised?" &c., it is very clear that what these persons denied was the resurrection of those who were really dead; the purport of the supposed objection is that a resurrection of the dead is an absurdity—the question is put with the idea that it is unanswerable.

Now, had the apostle believed according to the speculations we are considering, would he not have met his cavilling objector in some such words as these: "My dear friend, the matter is not so difficult as you imagine; though the body crumbles to dust, the real man lives on, continuously and consciously, till the day of resurrection, when he enters his new and everlasting habitation." Or, "The resurrection of the dead is not what you suppose; it is not a resurrection from an unliving condition, after ages of corruption, but an immediate transition of the soul into a spiritual body, prepared to receive it. Yea, indeed, the germ of the spiritual body lies hid in this mortal frame, death merely disengages it to fulfil its destiny."

Of this I feel confident, that had the theorists of resurrection living now been in Paul's place, they would have met the deniers of a resurrection of the dead in such a way, and most reasonably too, if such be the truth.

Well, the fact that the apostle did not follow such a course is, in my estimation, decided proof that he had no faith in ideas of the kind. So far from that, he meets the denial of a resurrection of the dead in such a way as to show that he believed the dead to be as really dead as I do. He refers their resurrection to the power of that God who, from a dead seed, produces a living plant. He employs a line of argument which plainly and logically sets forth his belief that all future life for the dead depends on their resurrection, saying to those who affirmed that the dead rise not, "If your doctrine be true, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

If the apostle had believed death to be but "transition," and in the case of the believer, a gloriously transcendent transition, we should not have found him writing thus:—

"I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother and companion in labour and fellow-soldier, but your messenger, and he that ministered to my wants; for he longed after you all, and was full of heaviness, because that you had heard that he had been sick; for,

Digitized by Google

indeed, he was sick nigh unto death; but God had mercy on him, and not on him only, but on me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow." (Phil. ii. 25-27.)

How is it conceivable that the apostle would regard it an act of the Divine mercy to deliver Epaphroditus from a joyous entrance into the presence of his Lord and pleasures for evermore; and that the event of his friend and fellow-soldier passing into such a desirable condition, could be, to the apostle, the cause of intense sorrow?

This line of thought leads at once to that tender and memorable scene at Bethany, recorded so simply and touchingly in the eleventh chapter of John's Gospel. Jesus said to his disciples, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go that I may awake him out of sleep." Misunderstanding the sense of our Lord's words, the apostles replied, "Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well." "Then said Jesus unto them, plainly, Lazarus is dead." Let it be observed that, whatever so-called scientific cogitators may say to the contrary, Jesus spoke of his "friend Lazarus" when he said he "sleepeth;" and when, dropping the figure, he said plainly, *Lazarus is dead*. Even so did the sisters of Lazarus regard the event, for they both said, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, our *brother had not died*." The Lord assured them that *their brother* would rise again. And the historian tells us that, when Jesus had followed the mourners to the grave of his friend, and had prayed to his Father: "He cried with a loud voice—Lazarus, come forth! And *he that was dead*, came forth."

We must leave the reader to decide whether the language and conduct of the Lord and the Apostle Paul sanction the theories referred to; or the belief we hold and maintain, that, when man dies, "He returns to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish;" and that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust."

For ourselves we must say that our convictions and hopes regarding the resurrection of the dead have been entirely founded on the teaching of the Bible. Our prejudices and preconceptions were in strong affinity with the theory of a continuous life—that:

"Dying is not to die."

But being brought face to face with the concurrent testimony of the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, we found that we had been in error; and were led to rest our hopes for a future life on the faithful promise and almighty power of him "who raiseth the dead and quickeneth them:" that "the hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth unto the resurrection of life or of condemnation." And we are glad to know that the pages of the RAINBOW have led many to the same ground of confidence, and are still doing so.

Let not any be discouraged from doing so by the cry of "Bibliolatry." It is not the *book* we revere, but the faithful words of the living God which it contains, spoken by apostles and prophets, and by the Son of God himself. In acting according to the ordinary meaning of the words so spoken, we are doing no more than those who expect their servants to do with written directions. We can fancy their feelings if told by their servants, on finding they had done something else than the

Digitized by Google

language used in directing them expressed, "We did not think that your words were to be literally understood."

If we profess ourselves disciples and servants of our Lord Jesus Christ, and children of God, we shall surely most honour them by understanding their words according to their current sense, and not by our own fancies or predilections.

Sometimes we have been amused on noticing how tenaciously those who dislike literalism cling to the literal when they fancy that it favours them; and this fact convinces us that if they found the words of Scripture supporting their theories, they would be as staunch literalists as we are.

Meanwhile, adherence to the words of Scripture is unpopular. We have even seen a doubt expressed whether the words used by the apostles on such themes as death and resurrection expressed their own private opinions, or whether they themselves perfectly understood the words taught them by the Spirit of God. It is no wonder that those who think so should reject beliefs which rest entirely on the language of the Bible, understood in its ordinary sense, and in the light of the context.

The devout reader will be jealous of speculations that lead away from the plain teachings of God's Word. "If these fail, all else is rottenness, and earth's foundations stubble."

Edinburgh. W. Laing.

---

## THE HARMONY OF NATURE.

JUST on the rising ground I stood
Where stretching far beneath me lay
The field, the valley, and the wood
Bathed warmly in the sunset's ray.

The summer's day had reached its close,
And down behind the distant hill,
Descending brightly as it rose,
The setting sun was lingering still.

The village church's grey old tower
Quite warmed and kindled in the light;
The silent magic of the hour
Has changed the prospect in our sight.

The grass was ne'er so green as this,
The heath had ne'er so bright a hue,
It seemed that at the day's last kiss
The landscape blushed before our view.

The changing colours of the sky,
The sweetly scented evening air,
The cawing rooks who homeward fly,
The solemn stillness everywhere!

Digitized by Google

These, and a thousand charms like these,
Bestowed by Nature's liberal hand,
Which soothe the mind, the senses please,
Had spread their blessings o'er the land.

Who from the busy round of life,
That once surveyed a scene like this,
Has not forgot the world's cold strife
And dreamed for once in perfect bliss?

The rude wild passions of the day
Are hushed at last and laid to rest,
And peace once more resumes her sway
And glows responsive in the breast.

Alas that in this restless world,
Where fierce ambitions fire the heart,
Peace, from her throne so often hurled,
With mortal men is forced to part.

Who does not know the weary brain,
And, O far worse, the troubled breast,
How human solace proves in vain,
And vain our eager search for rest:

When through the long and toilsome day,
And slow-paced hours of sleepless night,
Earth's cares and troubles hold their sway
Alike in darkness as in light?

Then, then, O God, the sacred balm
Of such a peaceful scene as this
Gives us a foretaste of the calm
Of thine eternal perfect bliss!

And yet we can but own with pain
That often here on earth we find
How such sweet scenes are spread in vain,
For sin has made thy creatures blind.

They look, and yet they do not see;
They listen, still they do not hear;
And not in bird, nor brook, nor tree
Doth God or his great love appear.

In vain are stretched the summer skies,
And vainly breathes the evening air,
In things so sweet to other eyes
Their darkened hearts can have no share.

For them across the lovely scene
The shadow of a cloud is thrown
That not to other eyes is seen,
For it resides but in their own.

Digitized by Google

Ay, lower still—down in the heart,
There rests that heavy load of sin,
Which unforgiven still must part
Sweet peace from that vex't mind within.

And into Nature's song of praise,
Which moves and stirs the very soul,
From their own hearts a discord strays
That mars and disconcerts the whole.

As when we listen to a choir
Whose song rolls forth in solemn knell
And seems to set our hearts on fire,
One creaking note dissolves the spell:

So Nature's harmony is crossed
By that one harsh and jarring sound:
Its melody is worse than lost,
Its soothing sweetness worse than drowned.

. . . . . .

But soon the tints were fading fast
From out the darkening western sky,
The latest straggling bird had passed
And sought the rookery on high.

Now from the cloudless blue above
First one and then another star
Glance down with gentle eyes of love
Upon this world below them far.

The raven tresses of the night
Fall gently over Nature's face;
The world that had rejoiced in light
Was wrapt in slumber's dark embrace.

The day was done—its joy, its pain,
Its cares, its sorrows, all were fled;
The stars alone from sleep refrain,
But wake like watchers round the dead.

Yet not like feeble weeping eyes
Appear those lights so bright and still:
They raise our hearts above the skies,
Our minds with holy thoughts they fill.

Oh, God! we see in them thy care,
Thy gentle searching solemn gaze;
Thy eyes are resting everywhere
Regarding all our paths and ways.

And thou dost see the aching heart,
And thou dost read the troubled mind,
And thou wilt cure the throb—the smart:
In thee our only hope we find.

Digitized by Google

For thou hast power, nor that alone,
The will to do is also thine;
With joy we bow before thy throne—
In thee the will and power combine.

Then we with thankfulness resign
Our hopes, our fears into thy hand;
We know salvation's great design
Before the fall of man was planned.

And long before the beauteous earth
From out of darkest chaos rose,
And long before that sin's fell birth
Had dashed her beauties with its woes:

So long ago thy great decree
That sin, and hell, and death should die
Had made the future grand and free,
And bade life's darkest phantoms fly.

Thus every note that rings amiss,
And every harsh and jarring sound,
Will fall before that wave of bliss—
Will fall, and die, and not be found.

And thou shalt reign! And thou shalt reign!
The one supreme unrivalled King.
Life's battle fought, nor fought in vain;
And loud the hallelujahs ring!

A. DUNCAN GOODY.

---

## IMMORTALITY.

"Now if Christ is preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?"—1 COR. xv. 12-19.

"1. WITH the denial of our immortality there usually goes the denial of *the existence of God.*

"2. If there be no immortality, *our faith in Christ is vain.*

"3. *The security of the great virtues is gone* if there be no immortality."

The above is extracted from a volume of sermons recently issued by by Rev. Charles Short, M.A., of Dundee.

It is truly astonishing that an avowed reverent expounder of the Word of God should manifestly invert the teaching of that Word concerning the fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith,—the resurrection from the dead,—as teaching the essential immortality of man. In page 183, he affirms "the soul is the living diamond of the universe, and is valued because it is to live through the unending ages." The great adversary said, "Ye shall not surely die—ye shall be as gods;"

Digitized by Google

or, as the author expresses it, "Be as living diamonds of the universe." The author cannot plead ignorance of the fact that the advocates of "Conditional Immortality" necessarily believe that there is to be a life after death, and that every man that hath this hope in Jesus purifieth himself; yet he declares, referring to the apostle's reasoning with regard to the resurrection of Christ as an assurance of the resurrection of all the dead, "But our faith in these doctrines of Christ is vain if there be no life after death," manifestly implying if there be no immortality for all who have died.

The volume contains eighteen chapters on various subjects, the last two of which are on "The Duration of Future Punishment" (the chief title of the book), and which clearly show that the author is a believer in the doctrine of Universal Restoration, which is certainly more in accordance with the revealed character of God than the heathen dogma of "Eternal Torment." Ages of suffering—a Protestant purgatory—which restorationists regard as better than death, is an idea which is neither in accordance with reason nor Scripture.

The author may be reminded, or called to reflect, that "it was just when the coming of Christ began to be lost sight of that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul came to replace that of the resurrection."

J. L.

---

## THE DOCTRINE OF ETERNAL TORMENT VERSUS THE ATONEMENT.

NOTWITHSTANDING the many valuable books and pamphlets written against the doctrine of "Eternal Torment," this God-dishonouring dogma is still tenaciously held by many sincere Christians; the influence of sectarian bigotry and the power of a traditional creed seem too strong to permit the simple testimony of Scripture from gaining an entrance into their minds. The object of the following lines will be to present one or two arguments that are absolutely unanswerable, and yet are so simple and direct that they cannot fail to arrest the attention of those even who give but a most superficial attention to these important matters. The first argument that will be presented is this: That the doctrine of eternal torment is utterly subversive of the scriptural account of the atonement of Christ. The two doctrines are antagonistic; if the dogma of eternal torment be true, *then* there is no redemption for man; it is a penalty for which the cross of Christ makes no provision, and consequently the redemption of man (of any man) is perfectly impossible.

The necessity of an atonement is based upon the fact that the claims of law or of divine justice must be satisfied before it is possible for the divine clemency to be extended towards the sinner; whatever penalties have been incurred by man, the sinner, it is necessary that these penalties should be borne by the substitute, and when these requirements have been fully satisfied then God can be just, as well as the justifier of the ungodly. Assuming the correctness of this principle, how does the case of the sinner stand? Well, we are assured by

Digitized by Google

Divines that the penalty incurred by Adam through his disobedience was death temporal, death spiritual, death eternal, and by death *eternal* we are told we must understand *eternal torment;* this is the penalty due to Adam and to his posterity who fell in him. The question, then, is: Has this penalty of eternal torment been borne by Christ, our substitute; because, if not, there can be no redemption for man? Well, what is the answer? There can be but one answer to this question; there can be no pretence that our Saviour suffered eternal torment, for, if so, he must be suffering now. No amount of ingenuity, or versatility of imagination, can extract from the sufferings of the cross anything analogous to eternal torment: exaggerate the sufferings as much as you may, you cannot deny the fact that these sufferings were limited by *time*, covering a period, say of a few hours, and, therefore, whatever their intensity, they could be no equivalent for an eternity of suffering. What, then, is the result of our inquiry? Why just this, that if eternal torment be the correct and just punishment of human transgressions, and if there can be no remission unless the substitute has endured this punishment; then it necessarily follows that hitherto no such punishment has been borne by Christ, our substitute, and consequently, there can be no redemption for man, the demands of justice not having been satisfied. There is no escape from this dilemma; the death of the Cross, attended with suffering of a limited duration, is a standing protest against the Popish dogma of eternal torment; either the Saviour did endure the curse of the law, or he did not; if the curse of the law be eternal torment, then it is certain that he did not endure it, and if he did not endure it, human redemption is impossible. The force of this conclusion cannot possibly be evaded; vague suggestions about the dignity of the sufferer, and indefinite assumptions as to the intensity of the sufferings, are utterly futile; the dignity of the sufferer is one thing, the requirements of the law are another; and if the requirements of the law can be modified, or commuted, or condoned, to meet the exigencies of a theory of atonement, so might they be in the case of the sinner, and the sinner might be pardoned without any atonement at all. The scriptural account of the matter is that the exact penalty of the law (whatever that might be) was borne by Christ, and what we say is this, that if the scriptural account be correct, it is very certain that eternal torment was not endured by Christ and also that eternal torment is not the penalty of human transgression. An objection, frequently put forward by those who would resist a return to a more scriptural faith, is that simple death or destruction, or, as some please to term it, annihilation, is no punishment at all; men would be oblivious to so slight a penalty, would continue in sin, and would brave the consequences. Now, have those who raise this objection ever weighed the bearing of their words? Death no punishment? Christ died for sin, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. Was the cross no punishment? The Good Shepherd laid down his life for the sheep. Was this no punishment? Surely those who talk thus are making very light of the cross. Here was one making atonement for the sin of the world (without the shedding of blood there could be no remission, because the blood is the life), Christ lays down his *life*, *dies* for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and yet they say the destruction of

Digitized by Google

the life is no punishment! What is this but saying that Christ's death was no atonement for sin? the law, according to them, requires eternal torment, simple death is nothing, and consequently, in their judgment, the requirements of the law have not been complied with. What a miserable dilemma for the advocates of eternal torment to be driven to! and yet there is no escape for them; such is the consequence of staking their all upon a mere dogma which is but the invention of man, and grievously dishonouring to God. It seems to us that it would be a severe punishment for sin, and a righteous thing in God's sight were every impenitent sinner to endure the same sufferings which Christ did; but obviously to say that death is no punishment is to make light of the cross, and to endanger the whole fabric of human redemption. When will Christians become wise? when will they abandon the traditions of men for the sincere milk of the word? There is no mystery about the subject but such as men themselves have conjured up; the words of the Scripture are plain, "The soul that sinneth it shall *die*;" you have but to accept the words of Scripture in their plain and obvious meaning, and the whole subject is as clear as the day—it is the spiritualising and non-natural renderings that mystify the reader, and that keep the minds of Christians in darkness. May God give his Holy Spirit to teach men his truth, and may there be a more decided stand taken for God and his Word. Some have given up the dogma of eternal torment to embrace, perhaps, a more subtle error, Universalism; but may God give wisdom to his people to keep strictly to his Word, and then shall they witness faithfully for him in this cloudy and dark day.

Woodbridge Lodge,
Oxford.

CHARLES UNDERHILL.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### FRESH WITNESSES.

SIR,—Will you allow me to draw the attention of distributors of useful books to two reprints, each in its own way excellently well fitted to open the question of immortality among different orders of minds.

The first is a short series of sermons on "Conditional Immortality," by Dr. Huntingdon, Rector of All Saints, Worcester, Massachusets, author of *Christian Believing and Living*, in which he stoutly maintains the truth that eternal life is in Christ alone, and sets it forth in a manner fitted to arrest the attention of Anglican clergy and laity. The second is a handy pamphlet of 64 pages, called "Truth set Free, or a concise view of the Scripture Doctrine of Immortality and Future Punishment," by Silas Henn, of Dudley. This is precisely adapted for circulation among the laity of the various Methodist denominations. They are sold at a very low price by Mr. Stock—sixpence, and deserve to be added to the stores of all who collect and dispense publications on this question. I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

EDWARD WHITE.

Digitized by Google

## THE EFFECT OF CUSTOM.

DEAR SIR,—The thought has just struck me that perhaps few of your readers are acquainted with the opinions of the late great Baptist minister, Mr. James Wells, of the Surrey Tabernacle, on the subject of Eternal Torment. I therefore beg to submit to you the enclosed extract from one of his "Letters to Theophilus," No. 62, published in the "Earthen Vessel," No. 177, vol. 15, bearing date December 1st, 1859.

I am,
Yours faithfully,
H. PHILCOX.

"That just one man's offence and personal few years' sins entail eternal anguish without hope or help—Is this goodness? Can you see here a *just proportion* between the crime and the punishment? No, you cannot, nor can any one else, and yet this doctrine of eternal woe is readily acquiesced in; and that simply because our minds have been *accustomed* to acquiesce therein."

---

## RAINBOW TRACTS.

DEAR SIR,—I am much obliged for the specimen tracts you kindly sent to me. They are admirable, and must do good service. I see you mean to *give* them away—generous, but unwise. I honour your motive; you wish to do good, and good certainly will be done by these clear and pointed expositions of truth. But the printing of these handsome little books must have cost a good deal. Accept 10s. towards this good work, and I hope others, many others, will help. The tract, "The Ministry of Evil," has been a blessing to myself and friends. J. D. L.

## EXTRA EFFORTS FOR TRUTH.

DEAR SIR,—Whilst reading the last very valuable issue of the RAINBOW, two thoughts came to me which, with your permission, I should like to see in print, as I have a sort of prophetic vision that they will prove useful.

1. Many years' service in the cause of unpopular truth, especially when that truth is of the first consequence, both in relation to theology and practical goodness, ought not to pass without recognition. Readers who regularly enjoy the Magazine, as it arrives, a welcome guest, on the first of every month, are perhaps seldom troubled with the question—*What does all this cost?* Does it "pay" the Editor and his co-workers, the publisher and his clerks? It is needless to name the printer and paper maker, for these *must* be paid, or the manufactured article—the RAINBOW, sparkling with the light of good news—could not be in our hands. *We*—the readers of the Magazine—*ought* to put the question, "What does all this cost?" We should be grateful for the light and comfort we have received. Now my proposition is a very simple one, upon which I shall undoubtedly act myself. Let every subscriber to the RAINBOW order two copies per month, instead of one, for 1879. This will be at once a graceful recognition of valued service, and a cheap way of advancing priceless truth. Give the extra copy to a friend, who will be sure, when he sees the quality of the Magazine, to order it for himself.

2. Let it not be forgotten that the RAINBOW stood alone for years, bravely grasping its standard amidst fierce storms of opposition. But I must not enter on this ground, of which the Editor knows more than any other man. What I wish to

Digitized by Google

say is, that *now* all our papers discuss questions which were formerly found only in the RAINBOW, it is just possible that our pioneer may have suffered from his very success. This should not be. Men who owe their light to the RAINBOW should not forget their first love, and give it up because there are others in the field. LET US DOUBLE THE CIRCULATION OF THE RAINBOW FOR NEXT YEAR!

AUSTIN MARCH.

Pimlico.

---

## UNIVERSALISM.

DEAR SIR,—If it were for no other reason, although I could name many, your determined and consistent opposition to the dangerous heresy of "universalism" leads me to do my utmost to promote the circulation of the RAINBOW. As you lately remarked, if men will hold the absurdity of natural immortality, it will be impossible for them to see the truth. Accept the divine truth of eternal life the gift of God in Christ, and all is clear and beautiful, worthy of God, and worthy of grateful acceptation. But the rationalistic doctrine of salvation through the fires of hell is worse than the Popish purgatory, and throws terrible dishonour upon the precious blood of Christ. No; Universalism is utterly false.

Yours truly, PETER.

---

## THE SECOND ADVENT.

SIR,—I hope you will give me leave to mention a fact that must gratify you and your readers. I know of two cases, in the large town from which I write, of ministers convinced of the necessity of the pre-millennial advent. Both those brethren have preached against it for years; but now they see that it is the doctrine of Scripture, and the only hope of the Church and the world. This is part of *your* reward, and I hope you will have strength for noble labour yet. (Gal. vi. 9.)

Yours faithfully, J. J.

---

## AN APPEAL.

DEAR READER,—By the kind favour of the much esteemed editor of this magazine, I am permitted to make this appeal to your benevolent sympathy for the purpose of promoting the success of the object I have in view; and respectfully solicit your attention to the following particulars.

Circumstances of long and painful affliction, with partial incapacity for labour, doctors' fees and treatment, have much impoverished the writer's very scanty means; while the gradual failure of his power and skill of hand makes the prospect of the future provision of his family a matter of great and pressing anxiety.

After much consideration, and with the hearty sympathy and good wishes of very many friends, the writer has decided to print, by means of a private subscription, "A Story of Village Life and Experience," which he has by him in MS., and which has never been published. He is the more induced to take this step by the consideration that the work has been much commended for its style, ability, and aim, by several authors and editors of reputation in their profession; and also by the fact, though only a working and self-educated man, he has succeeded in some of his smaller literary efforts in standing, in print, among names that are eminent in the literature of the age. His own much loved

Digitized by Google

pastor of many years, who read the MS. some years ago, and who was much interested in the progress of the work, says, in a letter dated only a few days back, "I do hope you will succeed in your projected volume. I am quite confident that it is likely to be useful, and will be read with interest."

The story, in its progress, conveys sound evangelical truth in a most natural and interesting manner, well calculated to arrest the attention of the thoughtless, guide the perplexed, and to meet some of the doubts of the sceptical: the whole developed by a series of active incidents—having their humorous as well as their pathetic side—which seizes and holds the interest and attention of the reader to the end.

The author respectfully appeals to all the benevolent readers of the RAINBOW, who have the means, to aid him with their subscriptions to produce the work, the aim of which is "the glory of God," and the promotion of the moral welfare of his fellows. By their kindly deeds, they will be weaving a bow of promise to an oft weary man, bright with the colours of hope, yet tenderly softened by the sympathy of Christian love. And may the promise be fully realised by all; in the delight and satisfaction of the reader of the little book; the relief of the sufferer and his family; and, above all, in advancing the glory of God and the good of man.

The response already, in the author's more immediate neighbourhood, has been most encouraging. But it will be obvious to all, that to prove successful, *a large number of subscribers will be required.*

The book will consist of some 200 pages, well printed on good paper, and published in a neat volume of the ordinary size, at the cost of 1s. per copy.

Subscriptions, which are respectfully requested to be paid in advance, may be sent in stamps, crossed cheques, or P.O.O., payable at New Wimbledon, to W. B. Barrie, Esq., 18, Fairlawn Villas, Merton, S.W., who has kindly consented to receive them on the writer's behalf.

Trusting to receive a generous response, the writer begs to subscribe himself,

Dear reader,

Yours most respectfully,

S. B.

## LITERATURE.

*Le Sentier de la Vie, et la Route de la Mort*; ou L'Immortalité conditionnelle d'apres L'Evangile.

SUCH is the title of a recent essay addressed by Dr. E. Petavel-Olliff to the members of the Christian Unions of Geneva and Neuchâtel.

"How," asks the writer, "can we augment our spiritual life? Recognising this as one of the objects of your programme, I should fail in my duty as honorary member if I hesitated to set forth a study which to many has already proved, and may to each one of yourselves become, a fresh starting point in the Christian race. This study is nothing short of a Biblical verity too long forgotten, that of immortality in and through Jesus Christ alone,—in other words, Conditional Immortality. As many of you are aware, it is now fairly before the Anglo-

Digitized by Google

Saxon mind. In France, M. Renouvier, the eminent Editor of *La Critique Religieuse* has recently introduced it to his readers in an article entitled 'The Great Question, Personal Immortality.' As he represents it, immortality is forced on no one; its conditions embrace not only decay but extinction. It is to be regretted that among our own French-speaking compatriots its essential point of view has never yet been presented in connexion with its inevitable issues. All we can say is that a few sketchy essays have served their turn. Ere long, I hope, an English work translated by one of our elders will fill the hiatus. Meanwhile, I offer a summary of what I believe to be the truth, illustrated by a series of corresponding citations. Those of you who are unable to read them in their originals will do well to consult the most faithful translations. Praying that you may share in the spiritual benedictions which not a few of your brethren have derived from this source, I rest, your truly devoted

"E. Petavel-Olliff."

*A Book of Remembrance* in Relation to the Mystery of God. London: William Poole, Paternoster Row.

To us this is a book of "mystery." If the author understands himself, which of course we are courteously bound to assume, it is a pity that he has not the illuminating faculty which conveys the same light to others. Until men give up mysticism, an intelligent apprehension of Scripture is out of the question. Just as a hint of what this book is like:—"The river that went out of Eden is the river of human history. Abel was the second head of the river; Seth was the third; the third river Hiddekel, was in its first state the river of a natural human mind," and so forth through 250 pages. All this may be interesting to those who delight in phantasm; to us it is an abuse of the Divine Word.

*Reuben Gaunt:* The Leeds Temperance Novel. By Miss Huddleston. London: Elliot Stock.

Well thought and well expressed. As a tale, full of interest. The characters are obviously drawn from nature, and the practical object of the book is seen in its title.

*Mary with Many Friends.* By Georgina M. Moore. London: E. Marlborough and Co.

An interesting story which will greatly please young people. "Mary" is rather precocious to our taste. She says things when very young which no child should or could say. But, the prodigy notwithstanding, we have read the book, and like it as a worthy book of its class.

*Beulah.* By George Dean Wilson.

This work, which treats of "Eden restored in Immanuel's land," has reached its seventh part.

## NOTICE.

Rainbow Tracts.—Now ready. No. 1, "The Ministry of Evil;" No. 2, "The Life the Light;" No. 3, "Life Everlasting." There is no price put upon these tracts, as they are not published, but printed for private circulation. Any one wishing them for this purpose will please apply to the Editor, 34, Sandringham Road, Dalston.

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

NOVEMBER, 1878.

## THE FIRST STEP IN JEWISH RESTORATION.

BY THE EDITOR.

"For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory; and thou shalt be called by a new name which the mouth of the Lord shall name. Thou shalt also be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God. Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken, neither shall thy land any more be termed Desolate; but thou shalt be called Hephzi-bah, and thy land Beulah; for the Lord delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married."—Isa. lxii. 1-4.

IF you say these are mere figures of speech, common in the flowery orient, poetical exaggerations which we matter-of-fact Westerns cannot fully appreciate, but must accept as suggesting the blessedness of the Jews when they shall be converted to Christianity and become members of the Church of Christ; if you say *that*, I have a right to ask what is the principle of interpretation which leads you to this conclusion? You must produce *some* intelligent canon, or logical rule of interpretation, for mere guess work, or ideal possibility, is simply out of the question. The suppositions of unbridled fancy, influenced by the mere sound of a word, cannot be accepted as the clear teachings of inspiration. It is time that "spiritualising," by which God's prophets have been made to utter riddles, were deposed from the theological chair it has so long usurped, that the reign of common sense might bring us into sympathy with the revealed facts of the future. Nothing can be farther from the truth than to say that the promises of national restoration to the Jews, which abound so largely in the writings of the Jewish prophets, are mere Oriental figures of speech which cannot be accepted literally. Those who contend for this are only consistent with their own baseless theory when they also teach that the present dispensation is the last under which God will deal with men, that "God has done with the Jew so far as



Digitized by Google

nationality is concerned," and that Christ will not return from heaven to reign over the world.

There is one passage of Scripture which has done duty for these allegorising brethren times without number, namely, Gal. iii. 28: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." This is an exceedingly precious truth, but it has nothing to do with the theory it is quoted to prove. It speaks of the unity of the body of Christ, and of a new and heavenly citizenship, of which all who have been baptized into Christ by the Holy Spirit are members. This baptism can be effected only by the Holy Spirit, and this relationship is immeasurably nobler than any that either Jew or Greek could boast. The Lord "came unto his own possessions, and his own people received him not; but as many as received him to them gave he power to become sons of God, even to them that believe in his name; who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God." This divine family is constituted such not by virtue of relationship to any human ancestors, however illustrious, but by being baptized into Christ, its Divine Head, by the Holy Ghost, according to the will of God the Father. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, bond or free" (1 Cor. xii. 13). "For our conversation—πολίτευμα, country, community, commonwealth, citizenship—is in heaven, whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change the body of our humiliation, conformed to the body of his glory." (Phil. iii. 20, 21.)

About all this there is a holy grandeur, a divine sublimity, which lifts it above all blood relationships and earthly localities. It is a thing by itself, unique in origin, character, and destiny, chosen out of the world, and given to the Son of God,—his special reward, his body, his joy,—and out of it he will select his high ministers of state in the government of his dominions during the ages to come.

But is there anything in all this to disturb the idea that God has a given people outside this Church, a people who are not of the body of Christ, but who are "beloved for the fathers' sakes," and whom he intends once more to localise in a given country* for noble and beneficent purposes worthy of his divine wisdom and goodness? Nay, does not the fact of this elect Church suggest, if it does not actually imply, that the Great Worker has other lines of thought and operation which will bless the nations, in subordination to, and

* "He hath remembered his covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations. Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac; and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant; saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance."—Psalm cv. 8-11.

Digitized by Google

in perfect harmony with, this fact? He has not lavished *all* the streams of his love upon the royal family in the metropolitan palace. Depend upon it the people of the provinces will be none the poorer for the wealth of the capital, nor find themselves forgotten by reason of the glory that excelleth. So far from it, the nations* shall walk in the light of it; and, consequently, the greater *its* splendour the greater *their* joy.

On biblical subjects especially men have been prone to draw hard and fast lines, all issues of the future both in relation to the Church and the world to be determined by the inflexible rule within which the preacher or writer had enclosed his creed. The bed of Procrustes has its very best illustration in the theological region. If you have a little outgrown the cast-iron creed holder, you must be crushed to its size; if you are rather short you must be stretched; and though either process is cruel, that is no matter, so long as the hard and fast lines are in their place. The impudent aspect of this—not to say the ignorance and arrogance—is that such men seem to think that God is under some sort of moral obligation to deal with the temporal and eternal interests of the entire human race, just as they think he should. But there is some little difference between thinking with God and getting God to think with us. Happily for the world and the Church, too, he neither alters his purposes nor takes counsel of his creatures; and he who intends to glorify the justified in the day which is known only to himself, when the number of the elect shall be complete, also intends that "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

Palestine,—the home of the temple and the hill of Zion, "the pleasant land," the "exceeding good land," the "delightsome land," the "glorious land," and what Milton so finely calls,

"The promised land, to God so dear,"—

Palestine has a history unparalleled by that of any other nation, a history interwoven with all that is holy and supernatural, and a history assuredly destined to be the study of men in the future as it has been in the past. To sum up all in one word, it is the record of the Divine dealings with the human race; and Palestine is declared to be the central nation of the world, in relation to which the geographical position of other nations was determined, although most of them were of larger extent than it. Thus in the famous song of Moses:—

---

* Omit "of them which are saved" (Rev. xxi. 24). The words are not needed to complete the sense, for "walking in the light" shows that these nations are safe; but, of course, *that* is no reason for omitting the words. The reason is that the critical authorities omit them as "not found in the ancient manuscripts."



Digitized by Google

"In the Most High's portioning of the nations,
In his dispersion of the sons of Adam,
He set the bounds of the peoples
According to the number of the sons of Israel.
For the portion of Jehovah is his people,
Jacob the lot of his inheritance." (Deut. xxxii. 8, 9.)

But it is every way reasonable to suppose that a land so selected, and so described, whose temporary inhabitants were God's covenant people, "the lot of his inheritance," and whose wonderful history is written in a Book which requires eternity for the development of its Author's purposes, will again be the theatre of events that will influence all the nations of the world. Especially if you consider the remarkable fact that the descendants and representatives of the temporary inhabitants of "the promised land to God so dear," are preserved in undoubted identity in every nation of the earth. These citizens of the world bear in their features the unequivocal mark of their origin, the proof positive that their true home is not the nations, but the land of promise. The Jew is a cosmopolitan, not by choice, but for reasons which it is impossible—and needless if it were possible—to describe here. But the fires of intense patriotism burn continually in the heart of the Jew. Palestine is the land of his fathers, of his dreams, of his hopes; and to Palestine, upon which the eye of God constantly rests, the hand of God will shortly conduct him. For the Jew says, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." (Psa. cxxxvii. 5, 6.) And God says, "Cry yet, saying, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, My cities through prosperity shall yet be spread abroad; and the Lord shall yet comfort Zion, and shall yet choose Jerusalem. And the Lord shall inherit Judah, his portion in the Holy Land, and shall choose Jerusalem again." (Zech. i. 17; ii. 19.)

To these reasons for restoration add one more of profound significance—that which relates to the vacant throne of David and his waiting heir. I could quote a great number of predictions from the old Testament prophets, clearly foretelling the return of the Jews to the land of their fathers, and their re-settlement there amidst circumstances of great prosperity and honour; but I must assume that you are acquainted with them, and hasten to devote a few words to the point at which we have now arrived. The prophet Isaiah was instructed to speak thus: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even

Digitized by Google

for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." And the angel said to Mary the mother of Jesus: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Well, these prophecies must be fulfilled, for Jesus himself tells us that "the Scripture cannot be broken." "The Word of the Lord endureth for ever." The Jews rejected their king. "We have no king but Cæsar," cried the chief priests in reply to Pilate's question, "Shall I crucify your King?" They hated Cæsar and all belonging to him, but their passionate abhorrence* of Jesus, mingled with a desire to conciliate Pilate, prompted the fatal reply. They have had a woful experience of Cæsarism through weary generations, and they will suffer yet fearfully under one Cæsar more, the last and the worst of their imperial oppressors; but the throne of David is still reserved for David's glorious Son, the royal heir, and he himself has predicted the words of enthusiastic joy with which they will one day welcome him as their divine Deliverer and Prince. The pathos and compassion which have thrilled like a living spirit through the following words ever since they were spoken, are crowned with the assurance that the people and their King will yet meet in the land of promise: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, *till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.*"

Unknown to the nations, and equally unknown to the Church, movements in this direction have been making ever since the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews; but the remarkable and extraordinary event which has recently occurred—the supremacy of England in Asia Minor—leads me to call it, from its *obvious* tendency, "the first step in Jewish restoration." Be assured it is not an accident that has raised a member of the house of Jacob to the first place of power in the greatest empire the world ever saw; and if the Anglo-Saxons be, as I think they are, on constantly increasing evidence, the lineal descendants and representatives of Ephraim† to whom the birthright was given, then an

---

* "Him whom the nation abhorreth." (Isa. xlix. 7.)

† In this question of the Identification of the Lost Tribes, there are two different views propounded.

The first in time is that which finds the Tribes in the so-called Teutonic nations generally. This was the crude and rudimentary result of the earlier investigations of the subject many years ago. It was the result which arose—one may say necessarily—in the very nature of the case. Because the conception of a radical ethnic difference between the British Family, whose august homogeneity was consummated at the Norman

Digitized by Google

exceedingly augmented interest attaches to the matter; then it would be literally true that in restoring the Jews to Palestine, we, Israel, should bring our "*brethren* for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations." But be the agency, or the people, what it may through which Jewish nationality shall be restored, that restoration is not only as certain as prophecy can make it, but it is positively essential to the accomplishment of God's revealed purposes in relation to the world at large. There may not be, there will not be failure in the Divine plans; every detail of the eternal programme will be filled in with perfect accuracy; and God, in the ages to come, will look upon the majestic movements of his providence and grace towards the world and the Church, as he did upon the magnificent works of his hands in creation, and pronounce them "very good."

Of course I know nothing of Lord Beaconsfield's foreign policy which is not known to others; but it is every way likely that my convictions regarding the future of "the scattered nation" may attach to his diplomacy a deeper significance than that which is attached to it by mere politicians. It is surely not difficult to understand how one who believes that the Jews will be restored to their fatherland, sees in the Eastern policy of England something more than is seen by men of the world who know nothing of God's revealed purposes, or

---

Conquest, and the Germanic Nation, with the apprehension of the logical consequences of that conception, had not yet arisen. Because the ideas of ethnic affinity which subsisted at the time of the inception of these investigations were founded on assumptions whose accuracy is now exploded, and which are now—as I have elsewhere shown—declared by the highest scientific authorities themselves to be inadmissible. Not only is it too late, at this time of day, to argue as if affinity of language involved a common ethnic origin, but the very affinity itself in the abstract of our own with typical Teutonic language is broadly questioned and controverted.

Nevertheless it was on the ground of such false assumptions that the theory of Identification was first based; could only be based, until further advance in ethnic and philological research on the one hand, and on the other of the clearer definition and application which that research confirms in a stricter interpretation of the prophetic writings, rendered it possible to eliminate inaccurate premises. So long as the question was thus tied to conditions and assumptions which strained intellectual acceptance by a defiance of the logical instinct of probabilities, it was confined—and this view is still confined—to a comparatively narrow circle.

The later advanced view has grown out of the former, rejects its errors, and displaces it. This perfected argument finds in the prophetic writings the clear identification of the British race and Empire as the heritors of the Ten Tribes; finds that while the Sacred Promises in all their marvellous scope have been in the past, and continue to be palpably accomplished in the accumulating events and circumstances of our national life, those promises have never been, and are nowhere being, as a plain matter of fact, fulfilled in the case of any other nation or race whatever. The British empire is such a "Company," or congregation of nations, "possessing the gate of its enemies," as not only never has before existed, but

Digitized by Google

by men who, though avowedly Christian, are so ill-instructed as to turn the clearest predictions of literal fact regarding the land of promise and the covenant people into parable or metaphor which finds its entire meaning in some privilege of the Christian Church. But what if this conviction regarding the future of the land and people is after all produced by a correct reading of the Jewish prophets? Then I am justified in anticipating results from our newly secured influence in the cradle-land of our faith which will add a fresh and wonderful chapter to the truth of the Bible, and to the ever growing evidence that the kingdom of heaven is at hand. There will be dark scenes, fearful convulsions, and great tribulation first; but Jerusalem shall yet be a crown of glory and a royal diadem in the hand of the Lord; and instead of "Forsaken" and "Desolate," "Hephzi-bah" and "Beulah" shall be the delightful names by which "the glorious land shall" be known.

"In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old; that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen which are called by my name, saith the Lord that doeth this. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the plowman shall overtake the reaper,

---

nowhere now elsewhere exists. But as the Tribes were to be scattered among, and again gathered from the nations, we shall find detached stray remnants in many lands. Some of these are recognised on the lines of original migration westward across Europe, in parts of Saxony, Denmark, Normandy; and again eastward in remote corners of Asia, whither detachments from the main body had early wandered.

As in the earlier interpretation which assumed a necessary community between our own and the Germanic nation, there is the absolute failure of any application in their case of those prophetic descriptions which in our case none can dispute so long as words have meaning,—it is the later and more strictly defined interpretation which makes the question vital and personal to each one of us. It is this, not the other, whose mere enunciation falls on the mind like sudden sunlight through a rent cloud; which at once commends itself to searchers in prophecy as the final self-evident solution of the impenetrable difficulties by which they had been beset. Not the other, but this, which has laid hold on the minds of tens of thousands throughout the length and breadth of the empire, strengthened the faith of the faltering, shaken the scepticism of the unbelieving.

Finally, let those who accept the Scripture as the Revelation of the Divine Mind, who believe that it is the summary presentment of the Divine method in the guidance of the affairs of the world, from the beginning to the consummation of all things, and that its development of the Law of Providence is the only true Philosophy of History, let them ask themselves if it be conceivable that precisely the greatest thing in all history, this British empire, with its absolutely unique conditions and surroundings, should have been left altogether out of account in the Sacred Record? If not, then let them point out how, or where else it is to be identified, than as set forth in the succinct argument which precedes these commentaries on the general question.—"Israel in Britain." By Cockburn-Muir.

Digitized by Google

and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and all the hills shall melt. And I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them. And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God." (Amos ix. 11-15.)

---

## ON CHURCHES.

WHEN we look around on the various sects and divisions of Christianity, from Roman Catholicism on the one hand to Brethrenism on the other, what conclusion can any reasonable man come to respecting them except that they are all, to a large extent, merely human institutions? From one end of the ecclesiastical heaven to the other, all seems *confusion*. In Roman Catholicism itself, compressed and kept together as it is by the iron rule of the Papacy, there are as many divergencies of thought and action as in other communions, only they are forcibly *suppressed*. To all of them, in fact, the epithet *Babylon*—confusion—may be applied. Surely, then, if we find, as I think most reasoning men must, that this word Babylon aptly expresses the present state of Christendom, is it not in the highest degree probable that the Christian Church, like its Jewish prototype, has gone into captivity for its sins?

These sins have been so many and so great, its iniquities and abominations so fearful, that the only wonder is that it has not been blotted out of existence long ago. Immediately after the death of the Apostles, yea, even during their lifetime, it rapidly became corrupt; just as in the days of Solomon, the true God was soon forgotten by those who had themselves witnessed the splendour and glory of the dedication of the temple and the manifestation of the presence of God in the cloud that then overshadowed it. There seems to be a marvellous resemblance between the Jewish Church of olden and the Christian Church of later days, both as regards their decline and the manner in which each was dealt with by God. Both, it may be said, started well; and both began to fall away with melancholy rapidity, while in both there were yet numerous *individuals* who remained faithful to their God. Both of them also became more or less heathenised, and, just as the Jewish Church was eventually sent into captivity, so also, as I believe, has it happened to the Apostolic Christian Church.

The words of the prophet Jeremiah to the captives of the Jewish Church seem to bear a striking reference to the professing Christian Church, and apply equally well to the latter as to the former: "This captivity is long; let not your prophets and your diviners, that be in

Digitized by Google

the midst of you, deceive you, neither hearken to your dreams which ye cause to be dreamed. For thus saith the Lord, that after seventy years are accomplished at Babylon I will visit you and perform my good word towards you in causing you to return to this place" (Jer. xxix. 8-10); the only difference being that instead of seventy years a far longer period was to elapse—a period no doubt more proportionate to the much higher calling of the Christian Church as compared with the Jewish.

My own opinion on this subject is, that both the Jewish and the Christian Churches went astray much in the same way, viz., by adopting heathen doctrines and heathen customs. In both the worship of "the idols of Canaan" was taken up and adopted, more especially the worship of Moloch, for that this last was the real object of worship became only too manifest in later ages; though it only existed in embryo—in the form of a *doctrine*—in the sub-apostolic age. The pure and simple worship of Jehovah was soon corrupted when the professing Church "mingled with the heathen and learned their works." There was indeed a *leaven* of purity and truth in it, and doubtless there have always been a considerable number of true Israelites in the Church, but this element sufficed only to preserve the Church from utter *destruction*; it could not prevent its captivity and servitude in Babylon.

The point, therefore, to which I wish to come is this,—none of the churches existing on earth at present are representatives or branches of the true Church; they are merely human institutions: the true Church having long ago gone into captivity. If the Church of Ephesus was threatened with the removal of her candlestick altogether, not on account of the commission of any particular sin, but because she had "quite* lost her first love;" is it possible to suppose that the multiplied abominations of the professing Church would not bring upon her at least a long captivity. As many as the Lord loves he rebukes and chastens, and therefore if he had—as we are sure he had—any love left to his erring Church, was it not a matter of absolute necessity that he should have hidden his face from her?

Even if we admit,—for the sake of argument,—that the promise, "Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world (age);" had reference to the apostles and their successors; admitting this, —which, however, I certainly do not,—are not all God's promises ever conditional on man's obedience? The prophet Jeremiah, for example, says, "Thou art Gilead to me and the head of Lebanon, yet surely I will make thee a wilderness and cities which are not inhabited." Even if, therefore, we allow—which, I repeat, I cannot do—the application of the words of Christ, "Lo I am with you

* "*Quite* lost," for "lost" simply does not give the force of the Greek word.

Digitized by Google

alway," to the successors of the Apostles, in the sense maintained by ecclesiastics, it would yet be implied that it should only be so if they continued faithful. Failing obedience, what he has once planted God will pluck up, and what he has built he will pull down when he pleases.

The very fact that Christians are, as we see them, split up into so many sects and divisions, is a proof that they have been scattered and dispersed. Like the builders of Babel of old they cannot understand each other's language, and though some of them have so far agreed as to be able to work together, yet that which ought to be the *grand proof* of their being really followers of Christ is sadly wanting: "By this shall men know that ye are my disciples, if ye *have love one to another*" (John xiii. 35). In truth might not one almost say that the converse is nearer the truth? Christendom is at present known quite as much by its quarrels as by its agreement; and therefore it is most reasonable to conclude that the true Zion is now in captivity.

Moreover, not only is this captivity still existent, but what is more, all attempts to get out of the city of confusion seem unavailing. New sects arise and fall, one after another becoming more or less involved in the same confusion that exists in the older ones. The voice, "Come out of her, my people," has not yet been distinctly heard. True it is that here and there *individuals*, and perhaps a larger number than we are aware of, have managed to escape, but it is only by twos and threes, and even these are unable to form any *visible communions*, or at least any that shall endure as such for more than a short time.

The history of Plymouth Brethrenism, so-called, seems to me the greatest proof of this, and it is full of sad instruction and interest to us. That great and noble movement, which commenced in Dublin some forty years ago, adopted the only principle upon which a pure and true church can long exist, viz., that Christians should meet together, as brethren, only in the name of the Lord.

The Brethren went on well in this way for some time, and had they continued to adhere to their original principle who shall say what blessed results might not have followed. But, unfortunately, they soon became nothing more than a Church in the ordinary acceptation of the word, and a most narrow and exclusive one it was, and continues to be: no people being more bitter against one another than the different sections of "the Brethren."

They were earnestly warned by some of their own number of the danger they were incurring when they first departed from their original principles, but, alas, the warning was unheeded. In words of almost prophetic insight they were told: "Your union will daily become one of doctrines and opinions, more than of life and love: your government, unseen perhaps and unexpressed, will soon be one wherein is overwhelmingly felt the authority of men; you will be known more by what you witness against than by what you witness

Digitized by Google

for; and practically this will prove that *you witness against all but yourselves.*"

Whether the view entertained by our highly esteemed and honoured friend, the late Mr. Henry Dunn, be true or not, the *result* is the same. His opinion was that with the death of the last of those on whom the Apostles laid their hands, *the Church* ceased to be in any sense an infallible guide, and henceforth existed —or ought to have existed—only as a body, of which the various members were to be helpers and comforters of one another. He held that the Spirit of God is given only to individuals, and not to bodies of men, except in the case of the first planting of Christianity, when the Apostles received supernatural gifts and were therefore enabled to say, "It seems good to the Holy Spirit and to us."

Associations of men, as such, it has been often remarked, have neither soul nor body, and we all know from experience how seldom a number of men acting in a corporate capacity will do what is right in any case where their general interest is concerned.

The reason of this is plain, viz., that bodies of men alway must include a large proportion of those who are not spiritually-minded.

True Christianity is a matter between God,—the Father of all spirits,—and human spirits individually. When we pray to God we do so in the belief that God answers and hears our prayers without any intermediary, and true prayer is more or less to be offered in solitude and seclusion. "When thou prayest enter into thy closet and shut thy door, and pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly."

Where then is the need of some body of men, calling itself "the Church" to interpose between the soul and God? St. James tells those who lack wisdom, not to go to the Church and ask for it, but to go directly to God himself; and in like manner our Lord tells us to call no man father upon earth, since we are all brethren.

Surely, then, the inference which we may fairly draw from these things is, that we should not allow Churches, or institutions of any kind, to become to us anything more than helps or facilities. The moment we pin our faith in any way on a Church, that moment the Church becomes to us an *Idol.*

I am no bigot on this point. I can see plainly enough that in many respects Churches, even as they at present exist, are capable of doing much good; and indeed that they do effect much good I would be the last to deny. But the questions remain whether the good that is done is not too dearly purchased, and also whether Christianity is not on the whole a loser by them.

With respect to Mr. Dunn's theory, viz., that the apostolic communities are not necessarily to be our model, and that the form in

Digitized by Google

which they existed in those early days was not intended to be perpetuated when *miraculous* guidance was withdrawn, I must confess myself to be still doubtful. There is one remarkable passage in St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (iv. 10-14), which reads thus: "When he ascended up on high he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. That we be no more children." Now this passage seems to speak of a time to come when these apostles and pastors and teachers should have done their work and be no more required. If the apostles and prophets have, as is manifestly the case, departed and left us, why should we suppose that now *any* miraculous guidance is given to the Church as such? If now given at all it is surely through the *writings* of those who manifestly had miraculous gifts. Have we not in fact now got all that is *necessary* to build us up and make us truly the children of God?

The conclusion at which I arrive, therefore, is that no professing Church is entitled to claim to be anything more than a *human* institution, and that as such it must stand or fall: the true Church being invisible. The evil that is caused by churches as they now exist, and as they have existed, is great. In the first place, it is through their influence and authority that creeds and confessions of faith have been drawn up, and thus the truths of Christianity have been hardened and crystallised into dogmas. Nothing can now restore Christianity to its original state but some such process of solution as Mr. Maude speaks of in the January number of this Magazine.

It is admitted on all hands, and by writers of every shade of theological opinion,—and it is indeed evident enough from the sacred records themselves,—that the early Christians had no other confession of faith than this,—"*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.*" The human additions to this simple and beautiful creed, are justified by theologians as being absolutely necessary to prevent the spread of what they call *heresy*. According to this view dogmas are like lighthouses, which have been erected on the spots where heretical barges have foundered, to warn away other vessels from such dangerous ground. A very sincere, earnest Christian friend put this view of the case before me some time ago, but I must confess that however ingenious it seemed to me quite unsatisfactory. I would rather say that they may quite as easily be compared to the "Will-o'-the-Wisp" that beckons on the misguided traveller into bogs and swamps. In other words, creeds create more difficulties than they allay, and besides that, they cramp and fetter the noble liberty of thought which is the inheritance of all true Christians. They put into words ideas and spiritual

Digitized by Google

thoughts that are utterly incapable of being expressed in words. As has been well said: "As we make creeds in order the more effectually to *judge* one another, God frowns upon our devices by confounding our language; so that the very words we use become traps into which we 'fall and are snared and taken.'"

In the next place Churches, as at present constituted, more or less encourage and develope *party spirit* and sectarianism; or, at the very least, they have a strong tendency to subordinate truth to the interests of the community. S. T. Coleridge has well remarked, "This was the true and first apostasy, when in council and synod the Divine humanities of the Gospel gave way to speculative systems, and religion became a science of shadows under the name of theology."

Creeds and confessions of faith became in fact mere *idols;* it being forgotten that they are nothing more than mere human *opinions*. Those, therefore, who call upon us to have definite confessions of faith are surely going beyond the express words of revelation. The one only authorised creed is, I repeat, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Had Christians adhered firmly to this, instead of adding to God's words merely human inferences from them, it would have never been possible for the mystery of iniquity to have made head as it did.

It would almost seem as if God had been teaching us how utterly useless mere agreement in opinion is to prevent apostasy. Indeed real and general agreement is simply *impossible* to men natured as they are, for none of them see more than a portion of the truth. Our minds are so constituted that we can only see one side, as it were, at one time, and therefore we should not *expect* agreement in *opinion*. Moreover, as Rochefoucault says, "We ought not to blame others for not thinking just as we do; for we often cannot make ourselves think what we *know* to be right."

Christianity is not a religion of doctrines or opinions, it is the religion of love, and it is love alone that can reconcile us one with another. How miserable a thing life would be if all men thought exactly alike on all subjects? What scope could there be for individuality in such a state of things? But if we be indeed united in love to God and to Christ, we may hold the most diverse opinions without ceasing to be Christians. Unity in diversity is the very law of nature, and it is their meeting together that is so beautiful.

But it may be said: "If this be so, what is the meaning of the apostolic command, Not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together?" The answer is that we are commanded to meet together in order to "exhort one another." But how can this be done in ordinary Christian assemblies? In the early Church it was carried out completely; for the apostle Paul tells us: "When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation."

Digitized by Google

How profitable and how delightful would be an assembly of Christians where all came together to worship God, and to talk quietly, in brotherly freedom, and without any of the ecclesiastical spirit, over passages of Scripture. This, however, cannot be done at present except in very small bodies, but we hope at least that when the cry is heard, "Come out of Babylon," something approaching thereto may be attained. After all the great consolation to us is that at the very best Churches are only means to an end; they are intended to keep alive and develop the Christian character, and even when they fail us, the individual Christian has still the divine guidance to fall back upon. He can always by prayer and trust in God, obtain that *light* and *love* which are the real objects of God's training and discipline on earth.

The servant of Christ is always a member of the true and invisible Church of the firstborn; and he does not forfeit his membership because he does not belong to any earthly Church. Our Lord himself, while on earth, would not allow his disciples to rebuke a believer, because he did not follow with them; saying unto them: "Forbid him not, for he that is not against me is for me." It is the *invisible*, not the *visible* church that is the real object of our Father's regard and love.

Nevertheless, a time will assuredly come when that voice, "Come out of Babylon, my people," shall be distinctly heard by all the people of God who will then as assuredly leave her. But this voice, as the context clearly shows, is not heard until just before Babylon's destruction. When her iniquity is full, then will she be suddenly and completely destroyed. Nevertheless, the analogy of Lot in Sodom proves that there are at this present time in the captive Church many of the people of God, who, imperfect it may be and in partial ignorance and darkness are yet true sons of the spiritual Israel. The passage, "We would have healed Babylon," proves that there was still left in her an element of goodness, capable of bearing fruit, but that element as time goes on becomes less and less, until it will have become so small that any further efforts to save her will be useless, and *then shall the cry come*. When that period arrives, God will make his way plain to his people, and "they shall come with weeping, and with supplications shall he lead them," to Zion, to the mountain of his holiness. Then may we hope for much greater unanimity and love among professing Christians than obtains at the present day. For even now when men are able to shake off their blind attachment to a particular church, it seems to me they soon become kinder and more tolerant to one another. While I say this, however, I do not wish to be understood as violently attacking Churches and seeking their overthrow. With all their faults they are no doubt necessary parts of the machinery by which men are being raised from the lower to the higher, and are used by God for that end. My contention simply is, that they are only adapted to Christians while in a state of bon-

Digitized by Google

dage, and that when once men come to claim their true heritage as the sons and daughters of the Most High, they will soon repudiate the authority of Churches as at present constituted.

* T. W.

---

## FUNDAMENTAL CHRISTIANITY.

1 JOHN iv.

IN the remarks which we are about to make,—and which are intended to be in some sort a sequel to those which, under the heading of "Christianity in Solution," we laid before the readers of the RAINBOW some months ago,—we shall start with an assumption and an admission. The *assumption* is this,—that Christianity *in its essence* is something higher and better than "the last of the mythologies;" that it has in it a divine immortal strength of goodness, and that even should heaven and earth pass away, *the words and the life of Christ* shall never pass away; so long as there exists a moral consciousness to apprehend their beauty, and a spiritual sensibility to respond to the touch of their heavenly inspiration.

And the *admission* is this; that in its *external developments*, alike ecclesiastical and intellectual, the Christianity of the past has, like Judaism before it, waxen old, and is ready to vanish away. That the theological conceptions of our fathers no longer avail to satisfy the moral needs, or to express the spiritual aspirations of the most enlightened and Christ-like of living men. Hence the work of disintegration or solution has commenced and is rapidly proceeding; so rapidly and generally, indeed, that the questions have become urgent,—What of the old may we hope still to retain? and what that is new shall supply the place of the old we have lost?

The great spiritual need of our day is that the living spirit of Christianity should EMBODY ITSELF AFRESH; rising, as it were, out of a death of illusion, obsoleteness, and decay, in a new and more spiritual body, adequate to express the developed moral consciousness of men and translucent to the light and love of God, now hidden and obscured by many a darkening human veil. And this reconstruction of Christianity is the sublime and ennobling work which has been committed--God working in and by them—to the sanctified intellect, the prophetic insight, the Christ-like love of His elect master-builders at this time; a work, surely, in which angels would deem it their highest honour to be permitted to share, and to be the veriest hewer of wood and drawer of water in connection with which is indeed an ample reward for the sacrifice of all earthly good, and even the endurance of martyrdom itself. How momentous, then, becomes the inquiry, Have we in Scripture any specifi-

Digitized by Google

cations, any plans, either whole or sectional of this new temple for the worship of men? Presumptuous as it may appear, incredulous as will be the smile with which the assertion is received, we yet venture, in unfeigned humility, to say we think we have; and that even in the one chapter which stands at the head of this paper, we may trace the inspired outline—though only the outline—of the new Christianity.

Yes, this *fourth chapter of John's first Epistle* is indeed a wonderful chapter. It tells us *four things* which in their mutual connection, and their necessary implications seem to us to include not indeed the traditional body but the whole living soul of Christianity; for it tells us: I. What God is. II. What redemption is. III. What the only possible bond of union between God and the creature is. IV. What the only true evidence to the Church and the world of the existence of such union between ourselves and God is. Let us meditate upon these four points a little; for they are, as John presents them, the four corner stones of the Christianity of the future.

I. In the first place John tells us *what God is*. He is so impressed with the overwhelming importance, the unspeakable blessedness of this divine discovery that he is constrained to repeat it twice, once in the eighth verse, and again in the sixteenth,—"God is Love." Oh, transcendent revelation! The world has had its gods many, and lords many, and it has variously defined them: but this definition is alone eternal; it can never be surpassed, never superseded. When we have said of God that He *is* Love, we have said our last word and feel that there is no need as there is no possibility of saying another. This character of God stands revealed in its own light: it has only to be presented in order to be recognised. When this voice is heard, all other oracles are dumb; when this light of heaven is kindled, all earthly lights are extinguished. It gathered up the purest, the sweetest, the most constraining emotions of the human soul, the filial reverence of the child, the self-sacrificing affection of the parent, the tender intercourse of wedded life, the tried loyalty of the friend,—it gathers up all these prismatic rays of creature love into its white light, and in it projects upon the human spirit the faint but not deceptive image of the Divine goodness.

If it should be asked, Granting that love is the truest and highest definition of God's nature and character, how is that definition itself to be defined? in other words, what is that Love which God is? We can turn to the matchless analysis of it contained in the thirteenth chapter of Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, and say: "Love suffereth long and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not easily provoked, imputeth not evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." And if it be objected that

Digitized by Google

at least some of the features of this Divine portraiture are not predicable of God: since it is impossible that he could envy any other being, or vaunt himself against any, or be puffed up with pride: we would ask, Are they not all not only predicable but, absolutely true *of Christ?* Yet Christ was "the image of the invisible God," in such wise that even when on earth he could say, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." We claim the meekness and gentleness of Christ; the self-abnegation of him who "being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God, yet emptied himself, taking upon him the form of a servant, and being made in the likeness of men;" the sacrifice of him who "purchased the Church and the world with his own blood;" we claim all these for the Father as well as for the Son.

Love is not one thing in us and quite another in God,—against this fundamental heresy we protest with all the strength of our most cherished convictions; with all the jealousy with which we guard our dearest hope. The measure of that love as it is in us may be but as a cupfull, while in God it is an everflowing river; but the quality of the water in both is the same. This is once and again implied in the chapter which is before us. Thus in the seventh verse we read: "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love." Now, plainly, the love wherewith we love one another, is a *human* love; yet *this* love is not only declared by the Apostle to be "of God," but he actually asserts that he "that loveth" is "born of God and knoweth God." That is to say he is a partaker of the Divine nature, because "God is love." Observe here that one common conception of love runs through the whole argument, which without that common conception would be no argument at all. For how would it follow that our love one for another was "of God," or that "every one that loveth is born of God," if *our* love were one thing and *God's* love another? As well, and as logically, might we say, he that is black is of the Caucasian race, and born of Caucasian parents, for the Caucasian is white!

No; human and Divine love are essentially the same in kind, though infinitely diverse in their measure: and the love which a selfish worldly son may yet cherish for a pious mother; the love which the veriest outcast still retains for her wretched famishing child, is an unquenched ray of the eternal light shining in the darkened chamber of their souls, and while it lingers there they are not utterly cut off from God.

II. But we pass on to notice, secondly, that the Apostle in this chapter tells us, *What redemption is.* "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (verses 9, 10). The object of



Digitized by Google

Christ's mission to this world was twofold. It was, in the first place, to demonstrate the ultimate truth that *God is love*; and secondly, to convince men, laying in darkness and in the shadow of death,—

> "For he who shuts out love, in turn must be
> Shut out from love; and on her threshold lie,
> Howling in utter darkness,"—

that God being love, *must and does love them.* In the knowledge of these two things "standeth our eternal life." We speak of the fall of man, and we speak truly, but the lowest depth of that fall is not the righteousness that has been lost, or the sin that has been committed, but the spiritual blindness and inability to believe that God loves them which supervenes, and which, unless it be removed, renders the salvation of any human soul impossible. Now it was to remove this that God sent his only begotten Son into the world. It was to remove it that Christ was born, and suffered, and toiled, and died. And from the manger of Bethlehem, and the carpenter's shop of Nazareth, and the mountains of Galilee, and the garden of Gethsemane, and the cross of Calvary, he has been crying to the sons of men for the last nineteen hundred years, "God is love, and he loves you," however far from righteousness, however sunk in sin, however vile and wretched and filthy; God loves *you,* and nothing can ever turn away his love.

Strange, and crude, and even horrible have sometimes been the theories of the atonement which men have framed, but in them all, however confined and distorted, there has ever been this element of truth, "God loves *me,* Christ died for me," and in this has consisted their saving power and transforming grace. Even in the conception of a sacrifice to appease the Divine anger, allowed and even sanctioned though it has been of God, we can recognise only a condescension to human infirmity; as though a child, having lost the confidingness of childhood, and having damaged or destroyed something precious in its parent's eyes, should come with what seems the price thereof in its hand, confessing its guilt, and begging for restoration to his favour. That father might be grieved by the want of entire confidence in his love thereby evinced, and yet if he saw that such entire confidence was impossible to his child at present, and that only thus could an obstacle to the outflowing of its love towards him be removed, he would accept and even prize it, not for his own sake, but for his child's.

Yet there would exist no demand or even desire for such a satisfaction on the parent's part, and,—though it may be admitted that only on this ground can God and men for the most part meet,—a larger and more unreserved love would lift us to that higher level to which David had attained when he could say: "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it; thou delightest not in burnt offerings. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." (Psa. li. 16, 17.)

Digitized by Google

III. Thirdly, John teaches us in this wondrous chapter *the nature of true religion*, or, in other words, wherein consists the only possible bond of union between man and God. "He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him" (verse 16). Union with God and man in love; this is the truest definition of Christianity as taught us in the words and life of Christ. "He that loveth not, never knew God; for God is love" (verse 8); in other words, separation from God in fear and hate and selfishness; this is the truest definition of the world that lieth in the wicked one. The latter being the outer darkness, the former the inner light of the spiritual world. "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." "He that loveth not never knew God." What a terrible indictment against much that calls itself Christianity do these words present! How do they as with one majestic sweep of God's hand set aside the mass of our controversies and the multitude of our divisions, and bring us face to face with the one really vital question, Are we dwelling in love, that is in God, or are we not? No matter how orthodox our creed; no matter how earnest our zeal; no matter how great our knowledge; no matter how unquestioning our faith; Paul has warned us that "though we have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though we have all faith, so that we could remove mountains, and have not love, we are nothing:" and John does but echo these words when he says here, "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" (ver. 20). Love is the perfect fruit of all true goodness, without which our Christian profession is indeed "nothing but leaves;" and the want of love is the bitter root of all evil, the very essence of spiritual death. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the heavenly city with its golden streets, and sparkling fountains, and unfading crowns, and celestial harmonies, and refulgent light; and Gehenna with its utter darkness, and despairing tears, and tormenting fire, and loathsomeness of corruption, are but the outward sensuous presentation, the inevitable embodiment, of the great spiritual fact that Heaven is fundamentally the experience of being loved and loving; while Hell is the inability of loving or being consciously loved.

IV. Lastly, the Apostle in this chapter points out to us the only availing and indisputable *evidence of discipleship to Christ*, and of our union with God in love, when he says. "This commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God, love his brother also" (ver. 21). "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples," said the Lord himself, "if ye have love one to another" (John xiii. 35). Love, then, should be the family badge of God's children; the mark of their common brotherhood; the light which they are so to let "shine before men that they may see their good works, and glorify their Father who is in heaven." Oh, can we wonder that Christianity should have fallen into decay,



Digitized by Google

and need to be reconstructed, when we hear such ceaseless wrangling about words, such contention for dogmas, such anathematising of one another for mere opinions, while Christ's seamless robe is rent asunder by angry hands, and his sweet home of love made almost a den of furious pugilists and murderers. Blessed be God, he who has learned that blessed truth, "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him;" and who has hearkened to that solemn warning, "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar," can even now rise into a higher region, and be hid, as it were, in the secret of God's tabernacle, from the strife of tongues. And soon, when the cry shall resound through heaven, "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen," another voice shall be heard saying, "Arise, and build again the temple of the Lord, whose foundation and superstructure, whose fashion and whose light is LOVE."

W. MAUDE.

---

## "THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY COME TO PASS."

REVELATION i. 1.

No. IX.

IT is important here and now to discriminate between works *and* works as severally noted in the Scriptures of truth, 1st. The works of the flesh which are manifest; 2nd. The works of refined Old Adam; and 3rd. Works which are the fruit of a living faith. Concerning those works whereof it is a shame even to speak, we need say no more than that those who have *not* been purged from them are not likely to appear before the tribunal now under consideration. The man that hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sin, and hath turned again to folly, will prove to be the dog or the swine returned to his former estate. The works of refined Old Adam are those deprecated by Paul, "the deeds of the law whereby no flesh shall be justified," "the commandments and doctrines of men;"—"having a show of wisdom in will worship and humility, and neglecting of the body;"—"meats and drinks, divers washings and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." But the works that especially engage our attention *here* are those advocated by James, such as "visiting the fatherless and widows in affliction, and keeping himself unspotted from the world; giving those things that are needful to the body of the brother or sister, naked and destitute of daily food," the fruits of a faith alive and lively.

For lack of distinguishing these, many have stumbled. At one time Luther doubted the canonical authority of the Epistle of James for its seeming contradiction to the Epistle of Paul to the

Digitized by Google

Romans upon this subject. Paul to the Romans said, "If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory." James said, "Was not Abraham our father justified by works when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?" and yet these two are in perfect harmony, while in seeming contradiction. Paul to the Ephesians in *one* passage, both deprecates the one and advocates the other order of work, where it is written, "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of *works*, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good *works*, which God hath before ordained, that we should walk in them" (Ephes. ii. 8-10). Thus it is clear that the two Apostles viewed Abraham from two distinct stand-points, yet were they both in perfect harmony. Abraham's faith was counted to him for righteousness the moment he rose at God's bidding to quit Ur of the Chaldees; and again, when at the same bidding he rose up early in the morning and saddled his ass for Mount Moriah, but in the *act* of offering up Isaac, his faith became *perfected*. Had Abraham offered up Isaac *without* command, and upon *that* ground had pleaded acceptance with God, his work would have been of quite another order, and as earnestly deprecated by James as by Paul. In truth, these two are as distinct as the fruit of the old stock which is wild by nature, and the fruit of the graft which the care and culture of the husbandman has engrafted; the one fit only to please children, the other fit for the table of a king. Whether or not, good fruit *can* come from the old stock which is wild by nature, and if so, what account God will make of it, are questions upon which Arminians and Calvinists will disagree until they meet at this judgment seat.

It was this order of works which James advocates, that the Son of Man with eyes as a flame of fire came down to inspect, when walking in the midst of the golden candlesticks we hear him saying in each of the churches, "*I know thy works*," commending some and condemning others. For we must insist that it was individual work here inspected and not the church or churches in the aggregate. And hence we read, "*Thou* hast tried them which say they are apostles,—be *thou* faithful unto death, and I will give *thee* a crown of life,—behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any *man* hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to *him*, and sup with *him*, and *he* with me,"—and in each of the churches we find it said, "*He* that hath an ear let *him* hear, *He* that overcometh, or, to *him* that overcometh." The scrutiny hereby declared calls for great personal searching of heart.

We have the same order of works noted in Rev. xiv. 13. "Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth. Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them." And that bad works follow us as well as

Digitized by Google

good, is manifest in that we meet both at the judgment-seat, where they must be tried of what sort they are, and for them receive reward, or suffer loss; whatever "receiving the things done in the body according to that he hath done" may mean. For now "there shall be nothing covered that shall not be revealed, nor hid that shall not be known and come abroad; that which hath been spoken in the ear in closets, shall be proclaimed on the house-tops," for now, "he shall bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the heart"—the *motives* from which actions have sprung. What secrets in relation to Church appointments must then come abroad! from the princes of the Roman Church in solemn conclave assembled at the Vatican, down to the Wesleyan Conference held with closed doors! How much of God, how much of man, and how much of God's and man's enemy there has been in them all, must then appear.

Personally accepted in Christ are all here found, and as members of the household of faith long since passed from death to life, they shall not *personally* come into condemnation. "Being now justified by his blood they are saved from wrath through him." Concerning their old sins before conversion, and their failures and shortcomings that have since been repented of and confessed he has said, "I have blotted out as a thick cloud thy transgression, and as a cloud thy sins;" but the question here and now is one of *works*, and bad works and bad workmen must here and now be judged, and the wood and stubble building, of which it may be the builders have been unaware themselves, must then to their surprise and consternation be consumed. All who have been building without God, daubing with untempered mortar, must here and now discover the true nature of their work, which before they would not believe, although the more discerning of their brethren have seen it, and it may be earned their censure for reproving it; but as bad workmen, their bad works must here and now be judged, and condemned, and consumed.

Right Reverend Fathers in God who have not shrunk from the flattering title of "My lord Bishop," seeing that it gave them rank among the peers of the realm, must then face their Master, who all along has said to them through the book adopted by them as their text book, "Seekest thou great things for thyself? seek them not,—mind not high things, but condescend to be contented with mean things" (see margin). How far this has been the spirit of some, whose gifts and parts and persons have been held in admiration because of advantage, while seeking to foist upon their admirers the figment of apostolic succession, the Lord will be judge himself.

Ministers too, who have come to their fellow men with excellency of speech and of wisdom, their speech and their preaching having been with enticing words of man's wisdom as eloquent preachers, earnest debaters, clever lecturers, feeding their flocks with husks instead of grain; stones instead of bread; *polished pebbles* it may

Digitized by Google

be, but not clean provender which hath been winnowed with the shovel and the fan; mistaking the food of the intellect for the food of the spiritual life. Sound doctrinal ministry ("*sixteen ounces to the pound*,"—we deprecate the levity of the term although we quote it as expressive of a certain class of teaching), wherein the five points are clearly defined, and hair splitting in orthodoxy is cleverly performed, may yet have no Christ in it, and therefore no food for spiritual life. Christ in his history, his miracles, his parables, his words and his ways adopted as themes for discoursing upon, but Christ preached *about* is not Christ *preached*. Christian experience is a fort with some ministers. The *believer's* experience, not his experience of Christ indwelling, but his experience of himself, and the exceptional experience of Job and Jeremiah, wherein they cursed the day of their birth, and the exceptional experience of David, out of which he cried, "Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy holy Spirit from me," is quoted as consolation to the believer, who by loose walk and conversation in the world has cause to cry, "My leanness, my leanness, woe unto me!" Special doctrines of revealed truth are special forts with other ministers, so that whatever subject is handled, the minister reveals his bias rather to ventilate his special doctrine than to quicken or to cultivate spiritual life in souls. All such daubing with untempered mortar, all such building with wood, hay, and stubble, including the raising of stately churches and temples, with towers and spires, all the preaching and publishing of clever lectures upon sensational subjects, all bazaars and fancy fairs got up "for the good of the cause" as professed work for God, must go through the fire, and so become manifested of what sort it is, how much durable, and how much combustible, how much of the *creature*, and how much of *Christ*. And when thus it shall be that a minister's work is all or well nigh all consumed, and he has nothing or next to nothing left to show for a twenty, thirty, or forty years' ministry, it is with difficulty we attempt to conjecture the state of that minister's mind, whatever his church dignity may have been.

Elders and deacons too, whose work has seemed to be to *rule* God's heritage, both minister and people, in such sort as to create revolt and secession, must meet their Master at length, and hear from him his estimate of their work. With seniority of years, or office, or force of character, or somewhat more of this world's good than their fellows, they have dared to crush their minister's spirit, to criticise his ministry, and to cow their fellow deacons after the manner of Diotrephes of old, and justifying only too well the saying of modern times, "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you; but resist a deacon, and he will fly at you." All this must be duly weighed and measured, and the merited reproof given and received.

That shame in some sort, and after some manner, will be the experience of some we gather from Luke xxi. 36; 1 John ii. 28, and

Digitized by Google

iv. 17. That full reward, partial reward, reward gained prospectively but lost eventually, are among the possibilities of that day we learn from 2 John viii. What it will be for another man to take our crown (see Rev. iii. 11), we wonder with great amazement; but there it is in the book, and its warning should not go unheeded. For now it must be shown how brother has wronged brother, presuming upon well-known acquaintance with the admonition, "do good and lend, hoping for nothing again," to make a prey of the brother; how it has been that in commercial life Christian men have found their fellow Christians the most difficult to deal with, being the hardest, most covetous, most grasping of any, often descending to mean and paltry ways, such as upright and honourable worldlings scorn. By reason of which the direction contained 1 Cor. vi. 1–4 has been found impracticable to those who would willingly have walked according to it. Our conviction is deep and of long standing, that if some Christian men could see how, in their dealings with the world and their fellow Christians, their Master—with his eye upon them, looking them through and through—is "crucified afresh, and put to open shame," they would be horror-stricken at their ways, and would hesitate less than they do to shelter themselves in the refuge of lies which high doctrines afford. How it has been that believers have formed self-indulgent habits and appetites, allowing such to grow upon them by slow degrees, the conscience becoming habituated to wrong has ceased to witness against it, until at length, the Apollyon, the destroyer, has gained his cursed end in cutting short their lives, and the light of this judgment seat reveals the dreadful fact that practically they have been *suicides*. It is perfectly shocking to think how the blessed doctrines of sovereign grace,—eternal foreknowledge, predestination, final perseverance, and overcoming of all believers are held in unrighteousness. *Blessed truths*, never to be called in question, still less denied; but we hesitate not to say that the way in which they *are* held by many changes the truth of God into a lie, and gives them license to live as they list, and continue in sin that grace may abound.

We ask again, How is it to be with such at the judgment seat of Christ? Does the Scripture throw any light upon the question? It is easy enough to conclude that Matt. x. 33, has nothing to say to believers, because Christ cannot deny one of his blood-bought ones, but we observe that our Lord is at the time speaking expressly to his *disciples*, to those who are of more value to him than many sparrows. Nor do we apprehend it to be denial involving *final* dismission from his presence, such as the words, "I *never* knew you, depart from me" indicate; but a denial of them as *overcomers* worthy of reward, a kingdom, and a crown. Whether Luke xii. has anything to say to these, where we find it written, "That servant which knew his Lord's will and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes.

Digitized by Google

But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him, lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. I tell thee thou shalt not depart thence till thou hast paid the very last mite," *we shall then and there learn.* Without adopting the Romish purgatory, we must admit these words of our Lord to have a meaning which popular theology finds it hard to explain. If these words have any meaning for the class now under consideration, we venture to suggest that in the neighbourhood of the judgment seat, outside and away from the marriage feast, there *may* be found a region called in the passage above quoted, a prison, where some will have to learn lessons they have failed to learn on earth, and where stripes of some sort, few or many will fall upon consciences that had become seared. "For all his ways are judgment—equitable (see Boothroyd)—a God of truth, and without iniquity, just and right is he "who hath said, "Mine eyes shall be upon the faithful of the land, that they may dwell with me," for it is written, "Thou art not a God that hast pleasure in wickedness, neither shall evil dwell with thee."

Among the strange and startling revelations of that day will be our manner of dealing with the mammon of unrighteousness, and whether therewith we have made to ourselves friends or enemies. If we have bestowed it upon ourselves, our wives, our children, our friends already rich, we shall not find *them able to befriend us* in that day, if in so doing, we have made God our *enemy.* Dean Alford's comment hereupon is noteworthy: "We are to use this mammon of unrighteousness to make ourselves—not palaces, nor barns, nor estates, nor treasures—but *friends*; that is, to bestow it on the poor and needy, that when it shall fail they—that is the friends—may receive us into the everlasting tabernacles." For God, and the holy angels, and all the saints will be on the side of the *poor*, and will befriend those who have befriended them. And especially will this be shown in our *final* act, in the disposition of our earthly estate by our last Will and Testament; an act which cannot take effect for good or ill until the seed sown thereby springs up and bears fruit, by which time the opportunity for repentance and amendment has with the life of the testator long passed away. *But* the fruit of such sowing *must* become apparent in the time and at the place we are now considering. The fearful responsibility of the Christian capitalist in this particular is, we fear, too little considered. What more natural than that the parent should "leave the rest of his substance to his babes!" Nothing more likely or more natural to the men of this world, but with the Christian—whose all is the Lord's confessedly—other claimants ought to be considered. If the children have claims, and perhaps the *first* claim on the parent, the right-minded Christian will

Digitized by Google

recognise other claims, and in times like these, especially when philanthropic effort abounds everywhere, and is crippled for lack of means. To whom shall the philanthropist look for aid if not to the Christian class of society? And while many in their lifetime contribute more or less freely to charities, we are well aware that in the provisions of their last Will and Testament it is too often forgotten that with their life will cease those contributions unless provided for in some other form. Few seem to reflect that the £100 left to this or that charity is a permanent contribution of so much *per cent. per annum*. And fewer still, we fear, reflect that Heaven's blessing will rest on the portions left to others, if with them the poor can take a share.

That selfish Will of that Christian man who, possessed of all his faculties, lived on to fourscore years, could not do otherwise than bear evil fruit, seeing that its provisions favoured only his widow and three children. The claims of his own poor personal relations and God's poor in the person of the widow, the orphan, the idiot, the blind, the dumb, and the incurable, altogether ignored, ample though his fortune was, to provide for each and all. We wonder not at seeing the two sons fall out, the elder driving the younger to sea, or some far-off land; the daughter married to some worthless husband who cared for her fortune only, and the widow bereft of reason, finds her home for life in some private asylum. Or that selfish Will of another who divides his fortune equally between his son and daughter, already well provided for on their mother's side of the family, so that both he and they could well afford to consider other poor and needy relatives of their own, as well as those God reckons *his* own poor. We wonder not at seeing the son and daughter fall out over some portion of the estate, and a life-long feud become the result. The *deodand unpaid* stood to the debit of the estate, and God has strange ways of taking his right when withheld by us. Will the survivors of these Christian men *alone* reap the evil fruit of an evil sowing, or shall the *sowers themselves* reap in some sort or sense at this judgment seat the fruit of their evil sowing? We ask the question suggestively, while we attempt not to answer it.

"Ah! who shall thus the Master meet,
Bearing but withered leaves,
Ah! who shall at the Saviour's feet,
Before the awful judgment seat,
Lay down for golden sheaves
Nothing but leaves!"

In the light of this judgment seat, Matt. vii. 13, 14, and Luke xiii. 24, may contain a reading for some which to them will be strange and new. When asked, "Are there few that be saved?" our Lord answered the question with an attempt to raise the faith of the inquirer from the lower level of bare salvation to the higher level of *overcoming* and "*reigning* in life," as the antithesis of being

Digitized by Google

"scarcely saved" with all our works gone to destruction. If the "destruction" here spoken of by our Lord, is a destruction of *works*—the worker "saved yet so as by fire"—it *will* be a new reading to some. And we conceive it possible that such latent truth *may* be in the passage; for whatever truth may lie upon the surface, there is mostly a deeper truth for those who can read it.

Our hope is that such heart-searching truth as we have attempted to suggest may not provoke a useless and hollow criticism, but rather a reverential inquiry, *how much* of truth may have been spoken, and what bearing it has upon the individual heart and conscience. If we expect our readers to be few,—in much that we have said—we expect our sympathisers to be fewer still. "Yet we speak wisdom among the perfect" (1 Cor. ii. 6; see Alford), the matured in judgment, or such as seek to be; and if in anything any be otherwise minded, if we have the mind of Christ, let them seek to have it too, for what we have spoken that *is* true will *continue* true, and its importance will *intensify* as the time for its fulfilment draws near.

We now proceed to consider the fall of Babylon on earth, and the Marriage supper of the Lamb in the heavenlies, the destruction of the counterfeit, and the manifestation of the true bride of Christ.

N. STARKEY.

Hackney, London. E.

---

## "THE ISRAEL OF GOD,"

IS the title of a book which sets up energetic pretensions to be a complete final refutation of all the arguments for the identity of the British folk with Lost Israel. If it fail to command attention from the unwary, it cannot be for lack of such advantage as comes of the assumption of superiority.

The historical fancies and fallacies of the writer are being sufficiently dealt with, in the *Banner of Israel* and elsewhere, by those who have made this part of the subject their special business. It seems hardly worth while to discuss his repetitions of interpretation of the Scriptures, prophetic and apostolic, because everybody instructed in the true doctrine of Israel knows beforehand precisely everything that can be said. These thick traditional integuments of the "blindness" which Paul foretold should happen to Israel until the times of the Gentiles were fulfilled, have been ripped up and scaled piecemeal time and time again.

The Lover of Truth—"Philalethes"—devotes a chapter to the philological argument; and it seems that the author of *Israel in Britain** is expected to answer the strictures on his statement of the case. It is very easy.

It is a severe trial of patience to deal with a writer who declares oracularly that the "Magyars of *Hungary*" (as if there were any

* Guest, publisher, Warwick Lane, Paternoster Row.

Digitized by Google

other Magyars) are not Turanian, but *Aryan*. Well, of course they are *not* "Aryan" by any theory, whatever else they may be. Their language at least is distinctly "Turanian," according to the accepted terminology, such as it is; and is of the same class as the Turkish; just as Turk and Magyar mutually claim a common ethnic relation. Again, we are told that the theoretical "classification of all languages" is into "three great families." By any theory, worth discussing, it is nothing of the kind. The division is into four families, at least.

Professing to represent part of the argument of *Israel in Britain*, he says that C. M. shows that

"though affinities of language cannot be regarded perhaps as a final and absolute test of race, yet in the few exceptional cases where a race has changed its language, the original language still survives in some shape (as in the instance of the Gipsies and of the Jews)."

There is absolutely nothing of the kind in *Israel in Britain*. What it says is precisely the reverse. It says that "there is no proof" that the coincidence of philological with ethnic relations "is not subject to exceptions so wide as to require the nicest discrimination," that, "on the contrary, there are instances *not* a few, and *continually accumulating*, of such exceptions." *Two* examples, "notorious and familiar," are taken, *because* they are notorious and familiar, that of the Gipsies and that of the Jews. Then it proceeds to formulate an *objection* that may be raised in these particular cases by an opponent, that "in both the instances cited the ethnic tongue has nevertheless survived," in one way and another. Upon this, the Lover of Truth lays the hypothetical objection on the shoulders of him who is combating it, and makes him say that "in the *few* exceptional cases" (which he had said are *not* a few) "the original language still survives!"

Having thus substituted for the argument in *Israel in Britain* another which suits the purpose better, as being easier to deal with, the writer proceeds to inform us that "*no uncertainty whatever* exists as to the proper place of the Anglo-Saxon in the family of languages." This assertion, made without proof, and contrary to proof, is nothing more than the repetition of the hackneyed story that Anglo-Saxon is Teutonic-Aryan. The Lover of Truth is so little conscious that this is the very thing which is contested, that all he can do to support the assertion is to copy from the books the classification of the Teutonic languages, out of some of which they say Anglo-Saxon is a fusion. Anybody can beg the whole question after that fashion. The whole question is precisely that the place assigned to "English" in the family of languages by the text-books and the received philology is *uncertain*, incomplete, and, at the foundation of the matter, untrue.

We are not so preposterous as to deny what is undeniable, that the muscles, the sinews, the integuments of the language are built up of materials assimilated first from the Saxon and Jütish, then from the Keltic, then from the Norman dialects with which our ancestors were in contact, and lastly from the Greek and Latin by academic contact. But all this leaves untouched, not only the substantial element in the vocabulary which can only be satisfactorily accounted for by reference to Hebrew or a closely allied dialect; it also leaves untouched the primary substance of the bones, the framework, the organic structure of the

Digitized by Google

language. It is not necessary here to go again over the whole ground on which we say, and on which Tyndale in 1530 said, and many others since have said, that the organic structure is Hebrew-Shemitic; not German-Aryan, as is now the fashion to say.

The author recommends C. M. to "look at the Anglo-Saxon spoken at the time of Alfred, and *its* grammar. He will find it a *highly inflectional* language," and "possessing those very characteristics which he cites as belonging to German." Well, it was because C. M. had looked a great deal at the "English" of those times, and did *not* find it "highly" inflectional, did *not* find that it possessed those very characteristics, that he concluded, as many others more competent concluded before him, that the radical genius and spirit of the language, even in its early stages, are as different from the High German, Old, Middle, or Late, as the genius and spirit of Shemitic speech are different from the "Aryan" speech. Here is some "English" that it is supposed Alfred himself wrote,—

He cwaeth that he bude on thaem lande northeweardum with tha west sae. He saede theah thaet thaet land sy swythe north thanon, ac hit is eall west buton on feawum stowum.

Any good Scot at least can read that.—"He quoth that he abode on that land northward with (by) the West Sea. He said, though, that that land be sooth north thence, and it is all waste but on (a) few stows (places)."

Again, we are told that "if C. M. had examined the old Anglo-Saxon, comparing it with the 'Gothic' of Ulfilas, the language most closely allied to it, and with modern Platt-deutsch and Dutch, he would not have come to the conclusion "that *English can only have come to be classed as Aryan by prepossession.*"

One must doubt if this writer can have read *Israel in Britain* with any sort of attention or intelligence. Manifestly, he is quite unconscious of the scope of its argument, and takes for granted as beyond dispute precisely the things which are in dispute. Without entering at present into a dissertation on the Gothic of Vulfila, the reference to *Platt-deutsch* is refreshingly unhappy. Having had—amongst other many odd experiences—to *talk* that curious lingo for about three years, and High German concurrently during the same period, and being impressed by hourly evidence of the organic structural difference—not to say contrast—between the two, C. M. was thereby led to say in *Israel in Britain* that "it is absurd to include in the definition *Aryan the Platt-deutsch*, for example, of Holstein, in parts of which High German is not understanded of the common people, by reason mainly of the very complexity of its grammatical construction." Further, that "it does not seem to have entered the minds of the theorists that *these dialects*, everywhere spoken by the *inferior classes*, or in remote districts, may be a Germanised survival of Khamitic tongues, of that earlier westward migration which seems to have preceded the advance of the Yaphetic and Shemitic hordes." This is, in effect, to dispute that these dialects themselves are properly classed as Teutonic and Aryan, and to explain their affinity to Anglo-Saxon by the "far less distance between the Shemitic and Khamitic types, than between both these and the Aryan." Whether the people who speak the dialects are Teutonic and Aryan is quite another question; they may or may not be.

Digitized by Google

But, says this writer, "C. M. appears to think that English is classed as derived from German through the mediate form of Low German," and that he takes "Low German to be a detrition of High German." When we refer to *Israel in Britain* (p. 20), we find that C. M. does not appear to think anything of the kind, and says nothing about English being classed as *derived from* German. What we find is—not what C. M. thinks, but what he again supposes a hypothetical opponent may say. "*We shall be told* that the *affinity*" (affinity being one thing, and *derivation* quite another) of English with High German "is not direct, but mediate, through forms of what is generically known as Low German." That is precisely what we *are* told, precisely what the Lover of Truth takes such pains, by the help of the "authoritative treatises," to tell us again. Then, so far is C. M. from taking low German to be a detrition from High German, that the whole tenor of his argument is to show that it is nothing of the sort.

For the matter of *inflexion*,—inflexional idiosyncrasy is more quantitative than qualitative; languages have to be classed according to the greater or less degree to which inflexion enters into their organic texture and substance, and inflexion is analytically nothing more than a completed form of the agglutination which characterises what is called "Turanian" speech. The old Egyptian on the one hand and the Hebrew on the other have each their forms of inflexion, just as "English" has forms of inflexion. But inflexion is not of the organic substance of these languages in the sense that inflexion is of the organic substance of Aryan speech, as in High German. And the remarkable circumstance is that while "English" has gone on ridding itself of inflexion, High German has developed one of the most complicated systems of inflexion in existence. Hence C. M. concluded that when the British folk were "released from contact" with Aryan Teutons, "their strong ethnic idiosyncrasy" reasserted itself, and revindicated "its independence by a continual divergence from the types to whose influence they had been temporarily subjected."

On the "position of the *verb*," Philalethes says "it is *not* a question of grammar, but of syntax." Well, the divisions of Grammar are "Orthography, etymology, *syntax*, and prosody," and as under syntax are discussed the relations of "subject and predicate," it may be said to be the most important part of grammar.

There are, however, in another part of his book, one or two points on which it is within my province to remark.

With reference to the fact, which is fact and not theory, that our national weights and measures are within minute fractions of being identical with the Pyramid geodesic standards, he says—"Granted that those found in the Pyramid are the same as those in use in England, what then? Our numerals come from the Arabs; we are not therefore of Arabic descent." There is no command in the Scripture as to the characters to be used for numerals. But this writer should know that the Scripture reiterates, again and again, with dread formality and solemnity,—

"Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in length-measure, in weight, or in capacity-measure. Just balances, *just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin*, shall ye have. *I am the Lord your God; which brought you out of the land of Egypt.*"

Digitized by Google

As I have shown already elsewhere—"the reminder which accompanies the command is," in the connection, "as much as to say—*I separated you from them of the false measures,*" the cubit of twenty decimal some uncertain thing or other and the rest.

But he adds, "Prove that the measures *were* 'heaven-given,' and not merely the same as in use in Egypt and elsewhere; prove that all nations of the Teutonic stock have not had the same system (superseded now in some by the more modern French one); and, above all, prove that God takes pleasure in any measures except a '*just* weight and *just* balances,' or that any are 'atheistic' or an 'abomination' to him but false and unfair ones." Let us take in their order the clauses of this paragraph.

1. *Prove that the standards of the Pyramid were heaven-given.* This *has* been proved, demonstrated by the overwhelming internal evidence of the measures and their kosmic relations, which no unaided human intelligence could possibly have provided; proved by the harmonic correspondence with the standards of the Temple, wherein "Solomon *was instructed* for the building of the House of God;" and will be still further proved by the extraordinarily complete numerical correspondence between the Pyramid and the Tabernacle, of which a Mason of high degree has given me his notes for publication when the expositions of this matter shall be resumed.*

2. *Prove that the standards of the Pyramid are not the same as in use in Egypt and elsewhere.* The standard of length in use in Egypt and "elsewhere"—wherever that may be—was twenty decimal some uncertain thing or other of inches, eighteen and some unhappy fraction, and so on, according as you go "elsewhere." The hieratic Pyramid cubit of five times five inches was a standard neither in Egypt nor "elsewhere" out of Israel, nor with them when they forsook the God of Israel and went "elsewhere." Everything about *five* was hateful to the nostrils of Egypt, and so it was that the Lord took Israel out of Egypt "by five in a rank" (see Exod. xiii. 18, *margin*), and for a memorial made everything about the Tabernacle by *fives*.

3. *Prove that all Teutonic nations have not had the same system* (as the Pyramid, or Israel in Britain). After four thousand years the British inch differs from the inch of the Pyramid by only one-thousandth part. The author does not seem to know that between Stockholm and Vienna, from Karlsruhe to Breslau, there are upwards of *forty* different standards, of which no two are alike, and varying amongst themselves, for twelve standard British inches, to the extent of three inches and two-thirds! But not one of the forty and more "Teutonic" standards is a just measure, not one that is not a sensible departure from any *determinable geodesic equation;* which, in the nature of things, must be the foundation for any common standard that shall be *just* in the eyes of him who "hath made of one blood all nations of men."

Philalethes talks of the "same *system.*" What system? The very characteristic of the case is that there is no system, nothing but chaos and utterly irredeemable contradiction of forty and odd untrue standards. To call chaos "system" is to trifle with intelligence. The truth is, that the official adoption by the principal Teutonic States of the French

* The papers will probably be continued in this journal.

Digitized by Google

metre has not, in the daily concerns of life, "superseded," but only *added to* the chaos another element of worse confusion; and everybody knows that the French metre is not a *just* measure, not truly what it pretends to be.

4. *Above all, prove that God takes pleasure in any measures except a "just weight and just balances."*

That is for "Philalethes" to prove. It is no business of ours. By the *consensus hominum*, by the anxious straining of all "civilised" nations after a one only universal system of weights and measures, it is manifest that a one only system is the need of mankind. As the fine mathematical exactitude of every relation of the kosmos is a concrete presentment of the Righteousness of the Supreme, it is manifest that there can be but one only perfect system which shall, in his eyes, meet the need of mankind, whom he "hath made of one blood." It is not conceivable that, when he gave the command, "a just ephah and a just hin shall ye have," he should not have provided the elect people with a just ephah and a just hin. The very motive for their election was that to them might be "committed the Oracles of God," in trusteeship for the nations. It is not conceivable that the "Israel of God" should not have been furnished with the means and instrument for righteous and just daily dealing for themselves and for *all nations*. The standards of the Pyramid are demonstrably the one only system which accords with the mathematical exactitude of the kosmos. They are demonstrably also the hieratic standards of the Hebrews. The British units differ from those standards only by an almost inappreciable quantity. They are of all units of all nations the only units which are distinguished by this singular correspondence. This is one of the identifications of Britain with the "Israel of God."

The French metre is confessedly an inaccurate measure of what it pretends to be; that is to say, it is not a true measure. What is by its nature untrue cannot be, in any sense, just and righteous. It is, therefore, an "abomination" in the sight of the Righteous Lord; and not only "whosoever maketh" but whosoever "huggeth a lie" is shut out of the kingdom. That which is not according to the perfect righteousness of God is away from and against God—"atheistic." The very genesis of the French metre was in the rankest and foulest hotbed of atheism recorded in all history, an atheism which not only "changed times and laws" but sought to abolish God himself. The French metre is the Mark of the Beast now being set in "the right hand and on the forehead" of the nations reserved to the fast-approaching doom, and without which mark the beast will not permit them to "buy nor sell." Just as on the eve of the Roman Empire all the tribes save one (that one which was already in shelter) of the Israel of God, were sealed to preserve them from the doom of the Gentiles. Just as now the Israel of God is sealed by the marks foretold by the holy prophets, and by the unbroken resistance of the British Empire and the United States to the contamination of the unrighteous measure.

One other matter in this book seems to need comment. The notions of the Lover of Truth on the "eastward position of churches" are strange. Everybody that knows anything of the subject of church-

Digitized by Google

orientation knows that the rule of easting *is* "peculiar to England," and was *never* "the universal custom of Christendom." It is not "regarded" at all "abroad." It is not "now *less* regarded here," but on the contrary very much more strictly. It is not true that "*many* new churches have not this position." Only a *few* here and there are not easted, and they are not easted because the crowding or other difficulty of site renders it impracticable. It may be said that these are mere assertions. Very well; the statements of the "Philalethes" are mere assertions. But the difference between the two is that these can be proved, if it were in the least necessary, which it is not here, and his cannot. The Kibleh (*Chald.* קבל, *before, coram*), or local direction in prayer of the Hebrews, was *toward the holy temple.* That is to say, a Hebrew to north of Mount Zion prayed looking toward the south, a Hebrew to east of Zion prayed toward the west, and so on, always looking towards the Presence, the Shekinah. So it is now with the Church of this realm, fulfilling the *prophetic* prayer of Solomon—"Hearken unto the prayer of *thy people* Israel, when they shall pray *toward this Place.*" Notoriously this is not the rule in any other part of Christendom.

These expositions I hope to be permitted to continue here from time to time. C. M.

---

## ON HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN.

(See Hymn 350.)

COME, brethren, and sigh with me over my plaint,
A libel enough to make filial hearts faint!
Brought down to a couch of weakness, I lay,
The love of our Father my solace and stay,
When lo! from his temple, when worship went on,
The note, "Awful Father," came mix'd with the song!
Thro' my casement 'twas borne; so grievous the jar,
Methought I mistook the sound coming from far.
"Hymns Ancient and Modern"—the volume in use—
I open'd at once, not to wrongly accuse;
But oh, my distress! No mistake had I made,
The libel in type clear and plain was display'd.
The Fountain of blessing, Jehovah the Lord,
Incarnate in Jesus—the all-glorious Word—
The God to whom bowels of mercies belong,
Was invested with *awe* in his children's song!
Moreover, the scene which their faith had in view,
When thus they were burning strange incense and new,
Portrayed God in action, man's bliss to complete,
Bestowing on Adam a suited helpmeet;*

---

* "Be present, awful Father,
To give away this Bride,
As Eve thou gav'st to Adam
Out of his own pierced side."—*Hymn* 350.



Digitized by Google

And could the most cursory glance at this scene
Perceive not the mystery 'twas purposed to mean,—
E'en Jesus receiving the Church as his bride,—
The Eve that was taken from his bleeding side?
Oh! how could the heirs of such riches of grace
See "awe" as they worshipped, in their Father's face?

But, hark to the signal! At earliest dawn,
Before from my memory the sad discord had gone,
Just over the casement that let in the sound
A dear little bird at her nest fluttered round,
With food she had brought for her craving brood,
To open whose bills she now coaxingly wooed;
So tenderly touching the notes that she trilled,
To hear was to know what her fond instinct willed;
And by every type of this tenderness fraught
Doth animate nature bespeak the glad thought,
Whenever the praise of our Father we sing,
"If such are the streams, what must be the spring?"
And how NATURE's lesson the COMFORTER seals,
In all his devotion the child of God feels;
For "Abba Father" is his fond sonship cry
With which he is ever inspired to draw nigh;
Not "*awful*" Father, expressing the dread
Which becomes the mere slave by a master fed.
The prodigal, wrapt in his father's embrace,
Did not thus respond to th' exuberant grace.
As long as he knew it not, service for hire
Was all that he framed his lips to desire;
But folded at length to his Father's breast,
The place of a son could alone be his rest.

Then revise, ye grave patrons of all degrees,
"HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN," though many they please;
The spirit of bondage cast out from the page,
Nor think by fine music the offence to assuage,
Of calling the true Father out of his name,
E'en styling him "AWFUL"—which is to defame;
Your songs make a censer his grace to present
From hearts that to own it do only seek vent;
With filial emotions you then will adore,
Unconscious of self, and awe-stricken no more.

J. K.

---

## THE MIDNIGHT HOUR.

IN the RAINBOW for September, 1871, we attempted to show the meaning of those words, quoted from the Prophet Isaiah xxi. 11, 12, a question scornfully put by the watchman on Mount Seir, and gravely replied to by Judah's watchman, first showing how they referred to the Jews, and then their applicability to the Church.

Digitized by Google

Again we say, "Watchman, what of the night?" for just now it appears a very pertinent inquiry, seeing that seemingly we have not only entered on the night, but are approaching the midnight hour. Is it so? Is there really reason to believe that we are near the midnight hour?

Remembering that in former days the prophets were commended for searching into things which did not immediately concern them, although it was revealed unto them that, not unto themselves, but unto future days, they ministered the things concerning the grace which is to be brought unto the Church at the revealing of Jesus Christ: that Paul told the Thessalonians that *that day* should not come upon them as a thief,—he expected they would be upon the alert: that the Lord Jesus called the Pharisees fools and hypocrites, because, whilst reading the aspect of the heavens, they did not observe the signs of the times: remembering this, we note that the charge of folly rests *not* upon those who search. He commands us to know, "When ye shall see," i.e., we are to know it. The Saviour's language puts the discerning of the time in the light of a peremptory command. It can neither then be wrong nor unprofitable to do as the prophets did, and as Christ commands.

It is perhaps replied, There have been so many mistakes. So there have been in every branch of knowledge. But we do not on that account consider that all further inquiries should cease. And let us remember that the mistakes which have obtained, appertain to the fulfilment of concomitant circumstances, necessarily obscure, not to the solemn and interesting facts themselves. We have the WORD—the word of prophecy—which renders to us "more sure" even the voice heard upon the Mount. (2 Pet. i. 19.) We have also WATCHMEN, and very solemn is the word to them (Ezek. xxxiii. 1, 6). And such is the measure of light now vouchsafed us; such the signs of the times, that more earnestly than ever we put the inquiry, "Watchman, what of the night?"

There are three things leading us anxiously to inquire.

The Lord Jesus said in his parable of the ten virgins, "*At midnight* a cry was made, Behold the Bridegroom." (Matt. xxv. 6.)

Again, when speaking of his return, he said, "And if he shall come in the *second watch*, or come in the *third watch* and find them so (i.e., watching), blessed are those servants." (Luke xii. 38.)

Then, again, the great pyramid leads us to believe that some great change will happen to the Church in 1881-2.

The question arises, will this *midnight* hour, these *watches* of the night, and this pyramidal measurement synchronise? Is it to be the hour of the Saviour's revelation to his Church; and are we so very near the time of his coming? But the terms, "*midnight*" and "*watches*," imply a certain time in some *special day*. It is a midnight hour of some day which has passed away; the watches also of some night, the day of which has gone by.

What is this day? Have we been passing through it, and hardly marked its course? Is it the period equivalent to that portion of time occasionally mentioned in the Scriptures and in connection with the prophets as "The end of the vision," "the end of days," "the time of the end," "that day," "the last day?"

Speaking of the resurrection, Jesus said, "I will raise him up at the



Digitized by Google

*last day.*" (John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54.) Now the last day of this dispensation will witness the end of the reign of the wilful king; on that, literally, the last day, the Antichrist will be destroyed and the Saviour will come with all his saints. But the resurrection of the dead in Christ and the change of the living is to take place before the time when the last woes and vials of divine wrath are poured out upon the Antichrist and his followers; when, therefore, the Saviour said, "I will raise him up at the last day," he evidently alluded to a season of certain duration of time, probably embracing the whole of the last few years prior to his coming with all his saints.

What then the probable length of this season, which may emphatically be called the last day, or the day of the Lord? That the closing part of this time will be the literal 2,400 days, or six years and eight months, we have no question. And that this period will be the last six or seven hours of this "*the last day*" we think very probable. May we suggest that this last day will consist of twenty-four years, as there are twenty-four hours in one day and night, just as there have been 2400 years or "evening-mornings" running their course from the time of Daniel's vision. So also from the termination of that period of time—a year for a day—there will be a short period of time of twenty-four years—an hour for a day—to the complete close of the vision. (Dan. viii. 14.)

Just one hundred of these days of twenty-four years to the day elapsed from the commencement of the 2,400 years to their close; that they were not to be 2,400 years of prophetic time, of 360 days to the year, is manifest from the more literal and correct translation from the older manuscripts of Daniel's prophecy, "Unto 2,400 evening-mornings," which implies 365 days to the year, in its historico-prophetical aspect, and afterwards, we believe, in a literal 2,400 days.

By accepting this suggestion we find the *Midnight* Hour; the second and third *watches* of the night agree exactly with the pyramidal measurement of the length of the great gallery of 1881-2 pyramidal inches.

We need scarcely, in this letter, say very much about the great pyramid, concerning which Piazzi Smyth has written and wrought so well; for many of our readers will have seen from his writings how impossible it was that this great pyramid could have been only a burial place, and how also it must be accepted as a METROLOGICAL and PROPHETICAL STRUCTURE.

That this huge pile of solid masonry, covering an area of thirteen English acres, having a substance of five millions of tons of stone, rising to a height of 486 feet, the highest, largest, and most ponderous stone structure ever raised by man, built to a microscopic closeness, accurately square, and astronomically oriental; has been built on a plan most scientifically perfect, is proved by the measurements of the Royal Astronomer for Scotland, above named, and made known to the public in cheap form, in a little work called "Philitis."

Its very entrance passage tells its date of erection to have been 2170 B.C., 150 years before Abraham, and 800 years before Moses. It is supposed to be "the altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord." (Isa. xix. 19.) The passages from the entrance to the centre of the pyramid are said prophetically to show the length of the different dispensations—a very fine,

Digitized by Google

thin, but exquisitely true line indicates that 2,170 years were to elapse before the Redeemer came. The first, from the entrance is a descending passage, which, at the end of 985 inches, gives entrance to another which rises towards the centre of the pyramid, which again at the end of 1,542 inches, gives commencement to another and grand gallery terminating at 1881-2 inches—then a distressingly low passage, on which a man must creep on hands and knees to gain entrance into the central chamber; yet there is a peculiar mode of exit above, just at the end of the 1881-2 inches, but which mode of exit is not suitable to human or walking bodies; prophetical and typical it is presumed, of the translation of Christ's watching saints—the way of "escaping all the things"—of the tribulation great which are coming upon the earth. Now the first descending passage of 985 inches, has accurately foreshown the length of the first dispensation from the dispersion to Moses of 985 years—an inch to a year. So also the passage leading from this point up towards the centre of the pyramid of 1,542 inches in length, gives exactly the length of the Hebrew dispensation. We may therefore very justly conclude that the further gallery of 1,881-2 inches will find its fulfilment in the termination of the Christian dispensation.

The Hebrew word which is in Isaiah xix. 19, translated "pillar," means any "raised up" structure which may have been erected for some special purpose appertaining to or for a god;—of course, by itself, any reference to the pyramid might be considered irrelevant to the subject of the Lord's second advent, but as a collateral witness it would seem to be of considerable importance; the more especially when we find the passages preceding that of the great gallery, with strange *coincidence* (if the reader pleases), but with singular exactness, give precisely the lengths of the two previous dispensations.

A day of twenty-four years, which has 1881-2 for its midnight hour, would commence at the termination of 1864, and end in 1888.

From the time of Daniel's vision, 536 B.C., 2,400 years would bring us to the year 1864, and then 1865 would probably commence the twenty-four years terminating in 1888. In which case 1876-7 would be the first hour of the night season, and 1881-2 the beginning of the midnight hour. We believe that the Lord will come for his church just at the midnight hour—that at that time the cry will be made: "Behold the Bridegroom." By whom will that cry be raised? not by the Church itself—it will be in a slumbering state; our preachers would not be believed—the cry must be so made, and by such indisputable authority, that it will not fail to rouse the whole body of Christ's people to inquire and search the Word. May we suggest that the cry will be made by the resurrected dead, who will come up prior to the change of the living—for Paul says, "The dead in Christ must rise first." Possibly, some brief period may elapse between the resurrection of the first-fruits and the change of the waiting Church; during which period, the resurrected ones may be permitted to show themselves to many who knew them before death; just as did the raised ones at the time of the Saviour's resurrection show themselves to many in Jerusalem.

Again, in reference to the Saviour's words (Luke xii. 38), "And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch," &c.—Our readers are aware that the Jews divided the twelve hours of the

Digitized by Google

night season between sunset and sunrise, into four watches of three hours each, from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m., and we may suggest that the twelve hours from 1876 to 1888, may be similarly divided into four parts, the first watch terminating in 1878-9, the second in 1881-2, the third in 1884-5, and the fourth in 1887-8. Here we find the portion of time just between the second and third watch to be exactly 1881-2; coinciding with the "midnight" hour at which the Bridegroom comes; and according also with the time fixed by the "Pillar of witness."

The signs are multiplying now, which indicate that we are nearing our great change.

It has been an expectation among nations that some wonderful change would take place at the termination of the 6000th near from the formation of our first sire.

"The prophecy of Enoch" according to Mr. Murray's "Enoch Restitutus," shows that the 6000th year of our re-formed earth must end in 1873-4.

The author of "the Day and the Hour" thought the same. And Mr. Barbour, author of the "Herald of the Morning," proved from the text of Scripture, which we have tested text by text, that such date was the terminal point. These two last named writers concluded that with the ending of the 6000th year of human history, there would follow at once the termination of our present dispensation.

But it will be found that the Lord has often permitted a further period of about six years to elapse, from the time of an outrunning prophecy, judgment, or dispensation, before its complete fulfilment, which period has often proved to be of a transition character: as for instance, The Justinian decree which gave the Pope his power was in 532 A.D., but was not complete till 538. The 1,260 years of his great power ended in 1792, the commencement of the French Revolution, but it was not finished till 1798. When Noah and the saved ones with him entered the ark, it was "on the seventh day" after that the flood commenced; a full six days were allowed to pass; and from Noah's day to this, in many instances, our statement will be found correct. Our Lord is a God of mercy.

The thought must still be retained that our Lord may call some of his church at any moment. Yet knowing that dates in Scripture are given by the Author of Inspiration for a purpose; that they were to be understood at "the time of the end (Dan. xii. 9, 10): that "the wise" to search—"should understand"—resting implicitly in the truthfulness of his word, we may expect to know very approximately the year of his coming. We know that God has promised to make known his secrets to his people at the time of the end; that the Lord Jesus intimated that we ought to discern the signs of the times; that the "good man of the house should have watched," and that had he done so, he would have been prepared for the coming of the thief; moreover, the Lord said he himself should come as a thief, and when men would have little if any faith in these truths.

Looking as we do at the signs of the times—at the marvellous diffusion of knowledge—the fearful ungodliness abounding—the almost coincident manifestation of all the signs of the end which Jesus gave, and also fully believing that the above interpretation of the time of the

Digitized by Google

end will prove approximately correct, we dare not withhold these thoughts.

Sensational! Yes, doubtless; but is it on that account the less to be believed? Sensational enough the accounts of the late catastrophes, but, alas! not the less true. Sensational indeed must be the Lord's second advent to our world; but come he will. Even so, come Lord Jesus!

E. H. TUCKETT.

---

## THOMAS DEKKAR'S UNDYING WORM.

MR. MAUDE'S recital in the last month's issue of the RAINBOW of the picture of "Hell in a Romish Paradise-play" as exhibited in the Tyrol, may well sustain a "rider" from an English rhapsodist of James I.'s time, in the shape of an anatomical description of the rodent worm, a phenomenal reptile which has done the Platonists and the terrorists good service from very early ages, and which some modern popular professors seem still disposed to keep in their museums, stuffed, for occasional display.

The shamefully perverted use of the metaphor of the earth-worm, adopted by our Lord from the poetic imagery of Isaiah, is just one of the many instances in which a market has been made out of popular credulity, by so disguising its true meaning and intent as to cause it to symbolise just the very opposite of what its divine Designer intended. This can hardly be termed a "pious fraud" though practised it may be with very pious intentions.

No one will deny that the earth-worm (*skoleex* in Greek) stands throughout sacred and profane literature as the emblem of corruption and death. Never does it stand as the emblem of life. As a figure of speech pointing to the grave, the propriety of the imagery commends itself to every man's understanding; while the fact of the skoleex outliving the victim-carcass simply declares that the carcass cannot survive the skoleex; in other words, the carcass shall never see life. How comes it to pass then that just one instance of the use of this figure of the earth-worm is selected and made to stand for the antagonistic condition of an ever-vitalised consciousness?—nay, more, for the central nerve of mental activity,—for the very fountain of exquisite sensation? How comes it to pass that pictorial imagery which, to any unsophisticated mind, can exhibit the victims only as lying under an irrevocable sentence of extinction, is tortured into a metaphor of unending life? It is no answer to this question to say that modern elegance and refinement contrive to substitute the classic vulture of conscience for the grotesque animal of the mediæval allegorists. The fact remains that both forms of speech assume the victim to be undying because the devourer is undying; they are both treated as proofs of immortal misery. One is weary in having to expose so often such an impudent forgery.

But now for "Thomas Dekkar's Dream; in which, being 'rapt with a poetical enthusiasm, the great volumes of Heaven and Hell to him were opened; in which he read many wonderful things. London. Printed by Nicholas Okes. 1620." This absurd book, like John Bunyan's

Digitized by Google

thousand and one rhymes on Hell, abounds with assertions, similitudes, figures, and descriptions, for which neither of them had the slightest warrant from Holy Scripture. Dekkar has a section especially devoted to the undying worm, the only passage we need here recite.

"The whips that lashed the damned were some of wire,
And some of iron; others were ropes of fire,
Knotted with ragged stones of glowing flint;
Which though in thousand forms they did imprint
Tortures upon their souls; yet there was one
To which all torments else compared were none.
A kind of worm there was, all speckled black,
That shot ten thousand prickles from his back,
Sharper than quills of porcupine, and longer,
And farther flying, and more swift, and stronger.
It bare a tearing forked sting behind,
Which in the striking did so strangely wind,
It wounded every way where it did hit;
Nor could it be put by, by force or wit.
This worm hath teeth of needles, and lay gnawing
Both night and day, black souls in pieces drawing.
The more 'tis racked, it lives; the more it fries
In flames, the less it burns;—and never dies."

The worshipful authority of Cyril Alexandrinus and of the holy Bernard is then cited in confirmation of the existence from very early ages of this formidable variety of the scorpion tribe; and the testimony is no doubt true enough. It is an instructive finale to Master Thomas Dekkar's rhapsody that when the curtain fell before his vision he woke up to the conviction that the wicked world around him contained worse devils than were to be found in Hell itself,—a sufficiently plain proof, if proof were needed, that the popular theological belief of King James's days was no more productive of the fruit of good living than it is found to be in the Victorian era.

JAMES WAYLEN.

---

## NOTES AND COMMENTS.

### JOB'S FRIENDS.

JOB'S friends belonged to a tribe which is by no means extinct. I suppose we have most of us, in our seasons of affliction and darkness, met with some of them. They know all about it. They can show us exactly where we were wrong. They had warned us. Thus they—with the utmost kindness—rub the salt into our wounds, sometimes adding a little pepper. Is not the following, taken from a recent fiction, a capital description of the modern Job's friend? It is a certain unfortunate, named Sam Craddock, who speaks:—"Sithee here, lads," he says to his friends, when he has been preached at in his trouble, "that theer's what stirs me up wi' their kind. They're allus settin down to explain what th' Lord-amoighty's up to, as if he wur a confidential friend o' theirs as they were bound to back up i' some road. . . . I dunnot say for 'em to say *nowt*, but I *do* say for 'em not to be so free an' easy about it. Now theer's owd ——, he's getten a lot o' Bible words as he uses, an' he brings 'em in by the scuft o' th' neck, an' it looks loike he's aw

Digitized by Google

i' a fever till he's said 'em an' getten em' off his mind. An' it seems to me loike, when he has said 'em he soart o' straightens hissen out, and feels comfortable, loike a man as has done a masterly job as canna be mended."

### ARE THE AFGHANS JEWS?

The hostile relations which have unfortunately arisen between the British Government and the Ameer of Afghanistan, render the question of Afghan Ethnology a very interesting one. There seems to be good ground for concluding that their claim to Jewish descent is well founded. Mr. Talboys Wheeler, of Calcutta, in an unpublished work, observes :—

"To all appearance the Afghans are of Jewish origin; not Jews of the orthodox type, the outcome of Jerusalem and the temple-worship, but Jews of the old, turbulent, stiff-necked type, who revolted at Shechem against Rehoboam, and set up golden calves at Bethel and Dan. The Afghans claim to be descendants of Saul, the son of Kish. They are divided into tribes, clans, and families. They distribute conquered lands by lot, perform the ceremony of the scapegoat, and build shrines on high places. Their features are unmistakably Jewish; but their language is not Hebrew, nor anything akin to Hebrew. It is conjectured that they are the descendants of the ten tribes, whom the King of Assyria carried away to the city of the Medes; but the loss of all traces of the Hebrew language militates against this theory, and it is impossible to verify the identity. In modern times they are Mohammedans of the Sunni religion, and traditional foes of the Persians or Shiahs."

In a foot-note, referring to the Jewish type of feature exhibited by the Afghans, Mr. Wheeler says that this to his mind outweighs the evidence of language. "The face of Shere Ali Khan, the present Ameer of Afghanistan, reveals not only the Jewish features, but the melancholy mania that belongs to the character of Saul."

### SPECIAL PROVIDENCES.

The recent lamentable catastrophes by land and water have revived the controversy respecting "special providences;" some Christians earnestly contending for such Divine interpositions, while others perceive so clearly the enormous difficulties involved in the assumption that some events are more truly and directly providential than others, that they are disposed to deny that "a special providence" is conceivable. For our own part we think much of the difficulty arises from the use of the unfortunate word "*special*." Substitute "manifest" for "special," and while nothing is lost on the one hand much is gained on the other. Enveloped in the mists of morning lies a long range of hills; we know that they are there, but to us they are invisible. Suddenly, however, at some particular point, the clouds are rent asunder, and we see one snow-clad peak rising clearly and sharply into the bright blue sky. There is nothing "special" about that particular hill; we feel no more sure of its existence than we do of the existence of those that the mists still cover; but it is *manifest to us*, and we point to it and say, There is such and such a hill. Even so is it in regard to providence. We must believe in *a universal* rather than a *special* providence; but nevertheless the working of that providence is not always equally clear to us. The true distinction is not between special and universal, but between *manifest* and *concealed*. God works behind a veil, but sometimes he permits us to see his hand through it.

Digitized by Google

### THE SLOW PROGRESS OF THE TRUTH.

A CORRESPONDENT writes thus:—

"There is a good and, happily, a *growing* number of men, who, with the aid of new beams of light graciously imparted, have been enabled to pierce the orthodox pall of stagnant darkness, and to imbibe varied measures of progressive TRUTH. But the mass of even Christian people, are still manacled and shackled in the chains of stolid ignorance, persistent prejudice, and dishonouring calumny. And even the dawn of a better state of things in the more active minds of the comparatively few, commonly progresses at a snail-like rate, as is too often evidenced by dogged hesitancy, expressions of doubt, and 'respect' for *established* and venerable opinions. While the tenacious grip of the circumstances of their surroundings, and the ungenial picture of probable attendant *consequences to themselves in this world*, hold them in an attitude of suspense, or seriously retard their advancement and active co-operation. Truly, to make headway in our Father's cause is *up-hill* work. It is encouraging, however, to be satisfied of the fact that,—'If the love of God sets us to work, the God of love will give us our wages.'"

W. MAUDE.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### "THE DOGMA OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION, IS IT OF MAN, OR OF GOD?"

DEAR SIR,—Under the above heading there is an article in this month's (September) RAINBOW by General Goodwyn, from which I quote the following:—

"The first acquaintance of man with his reconciliation to God was when the Saviour himself, after his resurrection, pronounced the word 'Peace' to his disciples, 'breathed on them,' and gave them his Holy Spirit to dwell in their hearts (John xx. 19); having come direct from the presence of God, where he had displayed, like a divine Aaron, the blood and the incense of his *living* Person, tokens of his finished work, and had become accepted as the surety and ransom for sinners. (Compare John xx. 17-20 with Levit. xvi.)"

There are two astounding *assertions* here for which one would require some authentic proof before receiving. Now, with regard to the assertions, I wish to put the following queries and objections, in the hope that General Goodwyn will reply to them and clear up the difficulties for us.

1. Was it really the case that the faithful prior to the resurrection of the Saviour were never conscious of their reconciliation to God? Was Abraham never aware that his faith was counted to him for righteousness? Were the disciples of our Lord never aware that they were reconciled to God when he addressed them with such language as,—"If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you?" (John xv. 19.) Or could the Lord use such language to any who were not reconciled to God? "*The word of faith*," which is "THE

Digitized by Google

WORD OF RECONCILIATION" (2 Cor. v. 19), was preached to Israel after they came out of Egypt. (Rom. x. 8; Heb. iv. 3.)

2. Did the Lord after the interview he had with Mary Magdalene on the day on which he rose from the dead go into the presence of God, and there display, like a divine Aaron, the blood and the incense of his *living* person, and then be present at a meeting of his disciples on the evening of the same day? (John xx. 17-20.) If he, like a divine Aaron, displayed the blood and the incense of his living person that day in the presence of God, it must have been in heaven, in the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, for he could not officiate as a priest on earth. (Heb. viii. 4.) And there must have been a considerable part of the time between his interview with Mary Magdalene and his meeting with the disciples in the evening taken up with the lengthened conversation he had with the two disciples going to Emmaus that day (Luke xxiv. 13-29), so that the *time* he was in heaven making the great offering which "had been accepted as the surety and ransom for sinners," must have been *very brief*.

General Goodwyn says that the Lord "*came direct from the presence* of God" when he appeared to his assembled disciples on the evening of the day on which he rose from the dead (John xx. 19); but, according to Luke, he had only *come direct* from Emmaus then, whither he went with the two disciples; for it was towards evening when they got there, and then he went in and tarried with them, and took bread, and then vanished out of their sight. (Luke xxiv. 13-31.) And then he went to Jerusalem and stood in the midst of his disciples, where they were assembled, and saluted them, saying,—"Peace be unto you." (Verses 32-36.)

The fact that in the fore part of the day on which he rose from the dead, he forbade Mary Magdalene to touch him because he had not yet ascended to the Father, and in the evening of the same day he invited his disciples to handle him, scarcely prove that he ascended to heaven that day, and made the great offering for sin. It is too wide an inference to be very conclusive.

If General Goodwyn would be kind enough to reply to the foregoing queries, or give us his reasons for making the assertions, he would greatly oblige a sincere inquirer after truth.

JAMES LAMB.

Cleveland, Ohio.

---

## REVOLTING LIES.

DEAR SIR,—The Wesleyans, like other sects, desirous of disseminating their views, have published a series of tracts. No. 87 of the series is on "The Future Punishment of the Wicked." Here is an extract from it:—

"The torments inflicted upon their bodies [the wicked] will be beyond measure great and terrible, and dreadfully various. There will be unquenchable fire to burn you, a lake of brimstone to choke you, everlasting chains to bind and press you, horrible darkness to terrify you, and the never-dying worm of conscience to gnaw you. If the body is afflicted here, though some parts may be in pain, others may be free from pain. But there [in hell] all the different parts of your body will be tormented; your eyes, your ears, your nostrils, your tongue, your head, your hands, your feet, yea, your whole body, will be in agony and torture. Take

Digitized by Google

the pains of the worst diseases that human nature is capable of, and add to them all the most exquisite torments that the most cruel men have ever invented to inflict upon others; they are altogether but as the prick of a pin, compared with the torments of hell, where there is punishment without ease, darkness without light, horror without comfort, justice without mercy, wrath without pity, and misery without end. Your company will consist of devils and damned spirits, and their torments, and shrieks and groans will increase your misery. Devils will be your tormentors; they have no mercy; they will not spare you, but will torment you to the utmost of their power. If you die without conversion the infinite wrath of God will seize upon you with a devouring fire, in which you will be for ever burning, and never consumed; ever roaring in the pangs of death, and never rid of those pangs. After you have endured these miseries as many thousands of years and ages, as there are blades of grass on the earth or sands upon the sea shore, you will be no nearer the end of your torments than you were when you were first cast into them."

Here is another extract. "The Holy God, their incensed judge, 'will laugh at their calamity, and mock when their fear cometh.' The devils will reproach them. The righteous also shall see this, and shall laugh the wicked man to scorn, saying, 'Lo, this is the man that took not God for his portion, but perishing vanities, and strengthened himself in his wickedness.' (Psalm lii. 7, 8.) All their other torments will be infinitely increased by despair, which will overwhelm their souls and become their everlasting plague. 'Despair,' as one has said, is the very hell of hells, and that which most of all breaks the very hearts of the damned.'"

If any person doubts the correctness of these extracts, and if, in passing 66, Paternoster Row, or the Wesleyan Conference Office, No. 2, Castle Street, City Road, he will step in and ask for tract 87, on the "Future Punishment of the Wicked," he will get one for a penny, 100 for six shillings, and he may learn that a considerable allowance will be made to booksellers, Sunday schools, and tract societies.

This subject has engaged the attention of the Wesleyan Conference, and Dr. Pope, the president, has consented to revise their catechism. I have sent you these extracts in the hope that their publication in your journal will further the work of Wesleyan theological revision.

In forming an opinion of the various Methodist sects, there are a few facts of recent occurrence that require to be taken into account. The Rev. D. Round believes in and advocates the pre-millennial advent of our Saviour, and remains a minister of the Methodist New Connexion. Silas Henn, who in sundry pamphlets maintains that, and several other non-methodistic doctrines, is, I imagine, a Primitive Methodist. At any rate, his heretical books are advertised and sold by the Primitive Methodist Book Room. And the Rev. Thorneley Smith has recently made it known in his published lectures on the second epistle of Peter, that he is a believer in the pre-millennial advent, and yet has not been expelled from the old Wesleyan body. Every year the question is put to every Wesleyan minister, "Do you believe and teach our doctrines?" I wonder what answer Mr. Smith gave to that question. His new

Digitized by Google

views are not Methodistic views. Although John Wesley's father was a Millenarian, he himself was not one. It will be strange, and as gratifying as strange, if Mr. Thorneley Smith should not get into trouble, in consequence of the change in his views. Time was, when Joseph Rayner Stephens, a Wesleyan minister of wonderful abilities, was expelled merely because he was secretary to a Church Separation Society. But now, the authorities in the various Methodist sects, do not seem in such hot haste to condemn, degrade, and expel; and in this all good men will rejoice. I am yours respectfully.

L. F. T.

## LITERATURE.

### Literature.

*The New Testament Critically Emphasised.* By Joseph B. Rotherham. Second Edition Revised. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons.

This translation, without being a word for word rendering, may be described as a closely literal version. It aims to give the exact sense of the original. It is not a revision of the "Authorised Version," but an entirely new and independent translation. Ecclesiastical words and phrases have, as far as possible, been declined when their use would have implied distinctions and assumptions from which the original is free. The Primitive point of view has been preferred. A perceptible colouring of the Greek idiom lies on the English, the manner of the original being regarded as reflecting its spirit. To avoid too great a strain on the style of the translation, underscored lines and (for the "separate nominative pronouns") black letter have been employed to supplement idiom in the exhibition of emphasis. A sign (°) indicates the presence of the Greek article when not rendered "the" in English. The full force of the article in the original can thus be traced in this New Testament. The Greek text used for this work is that edited by Dr. S. P. Tregelles; a text based on ancient authorities alone—early codices, versions, fathers. This text has been faithfully followed throughout, according to the principles observed by the translator. An introduction fully expounds the critical principles on which the emphasising has been done, furnishing hints also for reading and exposition; while references and occasional notes contribute to the completeness of the work. This edition is in all respects an improvement upon its predecessor. It is a book of very great value to English readers; and we heartily thank our brother for his labour of love.

## NOTICES.

General Goodwyn's Works.—These valuable works—which should be in the possession of every Millenarian and believer in the glorious doctrine of eternal life in Christ—have been greatly reduced in price, the desire of the Author being the diffusion of the truths they advocate as.

Digitized by Google

widely as possible. We hope his wish will be gratified. Such books do not come from the press every day. *See Advertisement.*

"E. N." says:—"I have much pleasure in circulating the RAINBOW tracts. They are clear declarations of Scripture truth, and therefore must be useful."

"C. M." says: "A friend brings me to-day the RAINBOW, and I hasten to express my delight at finding such a periodical devoted to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World,' but above all that the true doctrine of ISRAEL is accepted, and that the pernicious heresy of 'immortality of the soul' is rejected. It is manifest that the God of our fathers is pouring out his Spirit upon his people, to cleanse them of the traditions which make his word vain, and to purge them of spiritual blindness now on the eve of the Lord's coming."

"S. A." says: "I am much pleased to find the RAINBOW continues to be full of interest, and trust its circulation may greatly increase, so that truth may disperse the heresies of the dark ages which are still among us."

"W. W. J." says: "I am anxiously looking for the Anglo-Israel papers in the RAINBOW. I hope all our friends and fellow-labourers in that cause will in due time turn their attention to the subjects treated in your Magazine. Conditional Immortality forms no part of their investigations; although many like yourself may be its defenders, or like your humble servant, its more obscure advocates."

"C. M." writes: "I trust that your writers will be kept free from what is called 'Universalism,' which is in the teeth of the Scriptures, and no less pernicious than the doctrine of inherent immortality. The sin against the Holy Ghost, which is *the great sin of the time*, shall *never* be forgiven, neither in this world nor in that which is to come."

"H." says: "Thanks—a thousand thanks—to the RAINBOW! I no longer hold and teach the atrocious falsehood of eternal torment. I am delivered from that through your instrumentality, and I *see* now, to my inexpressible joy, 'that God is light; and in him is *no darkness* at all.'"

"N. S." writes: "Have you observed Ezek. xiii. 22, with its marginal reading, how strong it is against the restitution of all?"

"T. J." says: "The 'Rich Man and Lazarus' is a many-sided subject, and your way of regarding it seems marvellously complete in all its details. Under any circumstances, one must admit that the subject is handled in a most interesting and ingenious way, and I wish it the widest possible circulation."

"R. R." writes: "The last two numbers of the RAINBOW are profoundly interesting, Mr. Rotherham's grand theme, 'The Tree of Life,' being invaluable."

THE revised edition of Mr. Joseph B. Rotherham's *New Testament Critically Emphasised*, a most valuable help to students, is ready. Friends may obtain it direct from the Author, 24, Fawcett Road, Rotherhithe, London, S.E, post free, for the published price, 7s. 6d. P.O. orders he requests to be made payable at the Ludgate Circus office, E.C.

Digitized by Google

*** *The Readers of the "Rainbow" are invited to take notice of the reduction made in the prices of many of the following*

# WORKS BY GENERAL H. GOODWYN.

ANTITYPICAL PARALLELS; or, the Kingdom of Israel and Heaven. Royal 8vo, price 8s., with Notes, Illustrations, and specially-prepared Maps of the original occupation of the Land of Canaan and the Millennial Kingdom.

"Neither extracts, notice, nor analysis can furnish anything approaching to a fair estimate of what the volume really is, as to the richness, variety, and importance of the information which it affords."—*Rainbow.*

"Believers will do well to aid in giving the largest circulation to the Author's sincere attempt to place the Mosaic Record and Ordinances in their proper light: and to show their intimate connection and harmony with prophetic and Evangelical Truth."—*Christian Times.*

THE LAST ADAM. ("The Second Man, the Lord from Heaven." —1 Cor. xv. 47.) Crown 8vo, 250 pages, price 2s.

THE WHOLE ARMOUR OF GOD. An Explanation of the Christian Conflict and the Divine Panoply therefor, as taught in the New Testament; deduced from the pictorial instruction of the Old Testament. Crown 8vo, price 1s 6d.

THE COMFORTER IS COME; or, the Ministry of the Holy Spirit in the World and in the Church. Crown 8vo, price 1s. 6d.

TRUTH AND TRADITION: a Defence of the Doctrine that "The *Wages of Sin is Death*, but *the Gift of God is Eternal Life*, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Second Edition, enlarged. 1s. 6d.

THE MYSTERIES OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN; an Explanation of Matthew xiii. Price 6d.

THE SUBSTANCE OF THINGS HOPED FOR. A contrast to the immaterial and speculative system of Anti-Millenarianism, expressed in "The End of All Things," and other kindred works. Price reduced, 8d.

THE "GERSHOM" TRACTS. Packets of 8, Threepence each Packet. No. 1, THE MORNING STAR. No. 2, DAYBREAK. No. 3, SUNRISE. A Serial Record of Events according to Scripture, in connection with the close of the present Dispensation, The Personal Advent, and Millenial Reign of the Lord Jesus.

THE PARABLE OF THE TEN VIRGINS; Explained according to Scripture. Price 3d.

THE HIGH-PRIESTHOOD OF JESUS THE SON OF GOD, according to the Scriptures—in connection with the close of the present Dispensation, the Personal Advent, and Millennial Reign of the Lord. Price 4d.

THE NEW BIRTH, according to the Scriptures. 2s. 6d. per 100.

A BABY'S SERMON: on Infant Salvation. 1d.

SUBSTANCE OF A LECTURE delivered at Hull, Jan. 13th, 1875, on the Extinction of Evil. 2d.

HOLOKLERIA: What is Man? Inquiry into his Nature, Body, Soul, and Spirit. 3d.

SALVATION—Prefigured in the Baptism of the Son of God. Price 2d.

THE BOOK OF THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST Explained on the principle of permitting the Symbols to become the Exponents of the Phenomena with which they are associated. With Diagram. Price 6s.

THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST. Crown 8vo, price 4d.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

Digitized by Google

Cheap Edition, carefully revised and enlarged, post 8vo, price 4s., post free.

## LIFE IN CHRIST:

A Study of the Scripture Doctrine on the Nature of Man, the Object of the Divine Incarnation, and the Conditions of Human Immortality. With Observations on Recent Criticisms. By EDWARD WHITE, Author of "The Mystery of Growth."

"An exceedingly able work."—Professors B. Stuart and Tait in the *Unseen Universe*.

Now ready. Price Sixpence, post free.

## CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.

Plain Sermons on a Topic of Present Interest. By WILLIAM R. HUNTINGDON, D.D., (Rector of All Saints, Worcester, Massachusetts, U.S.,) Author of "Christian Believing and Living." With a new Preface to the English edition.

Second Edition. Now ready. Price 6d., post free.

## TRUTH SET FREE;

Or, a Concise view of the Scripture Doctrines of Immortality and Future Punishment. By SILAS HENN, Author of "Heart Yearnings," "Religion in Earnest," &c.

Now Ready. Price 5s., post free.

## THE NEW JERUSALEM & THE SAVED NATION.

An Exposition of Rev. xxi., xxii. By REV. SAMUEL MINTON, M.A.,

"I cannot possibly say what your book has been to me."—*From a Private Letter*.

Third edition. Price 5s., post free.

## THE GLORY OF CHRIST in the Creation and Reconciliation of all Things.

With Special Reference to the Doctrine of Eternal Evil. With a Notice of some Replies. By REV. SAMUEL MINTON, M.A.

Post 8vo, cloth, price 5s., post free.

## TWELVE DISCUSSIONS,

Proving the Extinction of Evil Persons and Things. By HENRY SMITH WARLEIGH, Rector of Ashchurch.

Crown 8vo, cloth, 2s., post free.

## EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT,

As Taught in Scripture. By the REV. W. T. HOBSON, M.A., Incumbent of St. Barnabas Church, Douglas, Isle of Man.

"There is no doubt of his theological equipment and the wide range of his Biblical studies. . . . . Mr. Hobson writes with a vigorous pen, fitted to do brave things for the cause of Truth."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

Crown 8vo, price 1s. 6d., post free.

## A DEMONSTRATION of the Extinction of Evil Persons and of Evil Things.

In Answer to Mr. J. N. DARBY and others. By HENRY SMITH WARLEIGH, Rector of Ashchurch.

Price 1s., post free.

## ERRORS AND TERRORS OF BLIND GUIDES.

The Popular Doctrine of Everlasting Pain Refuted. By REV. N. G. WILKINS M.A. and LL.M. (Cantab.)

"A powerful statement of the argument against everlasting pain."—*Church Times*.
"An unusually powerful pamphlet."—*Rainbow*.

---

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

Digitized by Google

# THE RAINBOW:

## A Magazine of Christian Literature, with Special Reference to the Revealed Future of the Church and the World.

DECEMBER, 1878.

## NOTE.

OUR arrangements for next year, though not yet completed, are, so far, satisfactory and full of promise. Able men, thoroughly competent to deal with the topics they have chosen will assist us and gratify our readers by their contributions. The revealed future of the Church and the world will, as heretofore, be at once the vast circle and the defined limits of investigation. The world, without knowing it, is groaning for its divine Deliverer and King. We must, therefore, pay special attention to the troubled nations, and bring the light of prophecy to bear upon them.

The atheistic science of the day is blinding the minds of many to the highest truths, and robbing God of their homage and services. This is matter of profound grief, so far as these men are concerned; but we must not fail to show, as we have done more than once before, that they are themselves unconscious witness-bearers to that inspired truth which they sometimes ignore as beneath notice, and sometimes allude to with ill-concealed contempt. They have been photographed for these "last days" by a light that never deceives. They are teachers of error in "perilous times," and we must warn men to shun them as more dangerous to humanity than pestilence or war.

Papers representing "Our Hope," which some three years ago was united with the RAINBOW, are discontinued with the present number; but the RAINBOW continues as heretofore, "a medium of communication between thoughtful men," each writer being accountable only for his own opinions; whilst the Editor exercises his right of insertion or exclusion according to his judgment. The Correspondence platform will remain open as before; but all will please to remember the law of courtesy; for every thing personal goes to the waste basket. We fight with error, not with men.

M M

Digitized by Google

## SPECIAL EDITORIAL ADDRESS.

WERE there nothing else of importance to speak to our friends and subscribers about at the end of fifteen years' labour, to thank them most cordially for their sympathy and co-operation is a duty which must not be neglected; and the discharge of that duty, they may rest assured, is a privilege of no common kind. For the difficulties that have beset my path from time to time during this long period of service have been such that but for two weighty reasons I should have given it up years ago in utter despair. Christian men, cradled in pagan traditions which make man an immortal god and God an implacable tyrant, turned their backs upon me as a traitor to my adorable Lord, although the direct tendency and repeatedly declared object of my labours was to manifest his glory—his glory as it shines in Scripture when the fogs of a dark and cruel theology—our miserable legacy from Rome—are scattered by the light of the Sun of Righteousness. One trial of faith and patience after another came upon me, besides the constant one of responsibility for all the cost with the pressure of extremely limited resources. Now a publisher must not offend a wealthy patron; now a printer must not contaminate his types by "setting up" heresy; now, a bookseller declines to supply subscribers lest his "brethren" should excommunicate him; and the wicked RAINBOW, driven from pillar to post, like a guilty thing troubling the peace of Israel, was often wearied of the sickening battle and almost wished, —like Elijah in the wilderness,—to die.

But, as already intimated, there were two weighty reasons for keeping it alive, which I placed in the balance opposite the troubles. First, I had the prayerful sympathy of a few holy and intelligent followers of the Lord Jesus who were yearning for the deliverance of his beautiful Gospel from the bondage of ages; and, secondly, I *knew*—so far as moral conviction can be called knowledge—that if the testimony of the RAINBOW could be sustained for a few years, by the help of loving followers of Christ, that testimony would commend itself to an ever-widening circle; for I felt positively certain that it is in harmony with that of prophets and apostles, and of the Lord of both. My certainty on this matter is easily explained. It is no theory of mine, but, demonstrably, the ACTUAL TEACHING of prophets and apostles, and of the Lord of both.

But we must not stand still, far less go back. There are matters of importance besides that of thanking subscribers and helpers, and looking back with wonder at the storms through which we have passed without suffering shipwreck, to which the kind attention of the reader is invited.

We want help, that the RAINBOW may be sent to thousands who are ignorant of its testimony to the unadulterated purity of apostolic doctrine. We venture at the close of another eventful year, very earnestly but respectfully to request all lovers of the teaching of

Digitized by Google

Holy Scripture respecting God and man, to avail themselves of the present propitious moment greatly to increase the circulation of this magazine, which exists for the express purpose of clearing revealed truth from the manifold errors of medieval and modern theology. The present time is propitious because men are "thirsting" for truth as they have not done for ages. I quote the very word, the expressive metaphor, employed by an intelligent gentleman the other day, in reference to thoughtful men in his neighbourhood. He said to me, "We are positively *thirsting* for light, and would submit gladly to any sacrifice to get it." But in this expression my friend only uttered the yearning of many hearts. Every where the feeling is the same now. The central wish of countless minds is just to know the truth. O, brethren! let us, by divine help, help them! It is an honour which we should not miss. There are no doubt some readers who would rather send a donation to the editor than ask their friends to become subscribers. We shall be thankful to receive such donations, and to send their value by post in copies of the RAINBOW to different addresses, as the donors may direct, or, in the absence of such direction, as the Editor may select.

This eagerness for information is a delightful fact, for which those who love our blessed Lord cannot be too thankful; but let those who "know the truth," and who also know that "no lie is of the truth," remember that a time of quickened interest in religious questions is also a time of much peril. False teachers are always at hand on such occasions, influenced by sentimental theories which have no foundation in Scripture, and consequently no divine light to shine on the mind of the inquirer and give him peace. This remark has been only too clearly illustrated by Universalist books and pamphlets during the past few years—books and pamphlets in which the anti-scriptural doctrine of man's natural immortality is either assumed as indisputable, or maintained by the old arguments whose utter worthlessness has been repeatedly exposed in these pages. The moment men substitute mere speculation, or theory, for Scripture, on matters about which we can know nothing apart from Scripture, they become "physicians of no value," and hinder the cause of truth in the world, whilst professing to help it. No eloquence, no learning, no ideal character of the great Ruler can justify mere mental theories respecting the destiny of men. What God has been pleased to make known on this profoundly important matter must be accepted as *final*. We must not venture to set aside the obvious lexical and grammatical meaning of Scripture in favour of some poetical or sentimental fancy of our own. For eschatology is not a philosophical region where we may disport ourselves at will, each trying to excel his neighbour in imagining what God *may* do, but a province which belongs exclusively to him who has told us what he *will* do. (Rom. vi. 23; 2 Thess. i. 7-9.)

This Magazine has been from the first avowedly a medium of



Digitized by Google

communication between thoughtful Christian men, and as such it has had many able discussions on questions of great interest both to the Church and the world, the Editor giving his contributors full liberty to declare their sentiments, each writer being held responsible only for his own opinions. This arrangement has been welcomed as a boon at a time which is characterised by extraordinary mental activity in every division of the Church, and every department of science and philosophy.

"The revealed future of the Church and the World" has been the text of the RAINBOW from the first number until now—a wonderfully comprehensive text, for it embraces every thing connected with the nature and destiny of man, the character and government of God, the meaning of redemption, the Church of grace, the kingdom of glory, the restoration of the Jews, the discovery and mission of the House of Israel, the future position of the nations in relation to the land of promise, the rise, career, and doom of the Antichrist, the destruction of all evil beings and evil things, the glorious reign of Christ and his saints, and the final ages when the magnificent design of the Godhead shall be realised, and "God shall be all in all."

The question of "Israel" is one of far-reaching importance at the present time, for this, among other reasons, that the world's future—I venture to say, its *very near* future—will be largely influenced, in accordance with the clearly revealed purpose of God, by Israel, commonly called "the lost ten tribes," and especially by EPHRAIM, to whom the birthright was given. This journal has to do with the revealed future of the world; Israel will be the chief earthly factor in that future; and Israel therefore must be sought and found—*if that be possible*—by facts and arguments which will at once satisfy the cultured and logical, and accord with the historical and prophetic Scriptures. There are, however, many Christian persons who think that the promises to Joseph's youngest son, and to the world through him, can only have a post-resurrection fulfilment. Let this grand question of God's "pleasant-child" (Jer. xxxi. 20) be examined calmly and thoroughly, without bias or prejudice in these pages. It is one of the chief themes of "the future," and will amply repay the research it demands.

But whilst our standing "text" is so comprehensive, it is bounded by the all-important word "revealed." This limit and safeguard, thoughtfully chosen fifteen years ago, is very important. Its theological value is increasingly felt when we read the writings of good men who, deceived by the serpent's doctrine of natural immortality (Gen. iii. 4), and unable to believe the incredible horror of "endless torments," glide, of logical necessity, into the haven of universal restoration. But this harbour of refuge is not in the chart, nor is there any need surreptitiously to put it there, for the sufficient reason that natural immortality and endless torment are as contrary to the Holy Scriptures as darkness to light, or falsehood to truth. You get these dogmas in all their hideous propor-

Digitized by Google

tions from cathedral and college, from pulpits Papal and Protestant, from books issued from every sect of the fractured Church, and from millions of what are mis-called "religious tracts;" but from the blessed and infinitely precious Bible, God's own Book—NEVER!

It will be remembered by those who were early subscribers that during all these years we have borne witness to the nearness of the Lord's Second Advent. This, in fact, has been our grand theme, our chief joy, a solace in trouble, a holy consolation in hours of sorrow, a motive for patient perseverance, and a hope of inexpressible gladness. And why should it not be all this? Is it not the purpose of God, the gospel of the glory (2 Cor. iv. 4, Greek), the blessed hope of the Church (Tit. ii. 13), the top stone of the living temple which grace has been building ever since the wondrous day of Pentecost? The *fact* of our Lord's promised return is undoubted, whatever may be said about the time; and its necessity in view of the inability of ecclesiastics to unite the divided Church, and of statesmen to give peace to the distracted world, has been habitually urged in this journal; and, we think, placed beyond doubt, at least in the case of men who are content to abide within our defined limits, the revealed future. The theological mistake of assigning to the ministry of the Church of grace a work which belongs to the high ministers of the King of Glory in the coming dispensation—namely, the subjugation of the world—has been repeatedly pointed out in these pages. Mediatorial grace electing a body for the Christ, and royal power commanding the world to "be still" in the presence of its great King, are very different things, which would not have been so lamentably confounded but for the double heresy of glorifying souls at death, and denying the pre-millennial coming of the Lord and the resurrection of them that are his "at his appearing and kingdom," when his saints shall be glorified together.

The time is short. Let us work for him! He is worthy. We tell him so in our prayers and praises. Let him see—let the world see—that we mean it by our intelligent efforts to diffuse his truth in its own native purity, free from the polluting presence of pagan tradition. This journal was begun—in obedience to what I surely believe to have been a divine impulse—for the purpose of teaching that the evening of this dispensation is upon us, and that the morning of the golden age is consequently at hand. For the dear Master's sake, our Redeemer and Life, let us tell men that his Gospel is all beauty, and that HE HIMSELF, who gave it its beauty, is coming to glorify all who love him. (John xiv. 3; xvii. 24; Acts i. 11; 1 Thes. iv. 15-18.)

Grateful for past aid in his service, and trusting that it will be continued for his sake, we wish for all our helpers the blessings symbolised by the glorious "Rainbow" seen by the seer of the Apocalypse "round about the throne;" and may the King, when he comes to establish his kingdom, say to each of us—"WELL DONE!"

Digitized by Google

## ANOTHER WORD "ON CHURCHES."

THE article of T. W. "On Churches," in November RAINBOW, has the merit of being extremely suggestive; and although some of its conclusions may appear startling, yet they are offered for consideration in so temperate a manner, that I am induced to ask the favour of being allowed to compare notes with your very thoughtful and candid contributor. Moreover, it seems to me, there are streaks of light running through T. W.'s remarks, the significance of which it is possible another eye may discern more clearly than his own. I will therefore presume to make a few suggestions on the subject in question—a subject which all will allow to have some important bearings on "the revealed future of the Church and the world."

1. My first suggestion is that "the true Church" has not yet fully come into existence. This may appear by asking two or three questions. Has our Lord yet finished building his assembly (Matt. xvi.)? Has the living Temple yet ceased growing (Eph. ii.)? Has the Christ yet presented to himself his *ecclesia* all-glorious (Eph. v.)? If not, then does it not seem a little incongruous to speak of the as yet unfinished church as having gone into captivity? The church total, final, glorified, and revealed is not yet in being.

2. My next suggestion is that the use of the word "church" to denote any definite organisation of co-existing local assemblies is without precedent in the apostolic writings. That is to say, we never read therein of "the church of Asia," "the church of Macedonia," "the church of Judæa;" although of "the churches" of "Asia," "Macedonia," and "Judæa" of course we do (1 Cor. xvi. 19; 2 Cor. viii. 1; Gal. i. 22). And if not of "the church" of any given province or country, considered as an organisation of all the local churches therein; how much less do we read of "the so and so (sectional) church of Judæa," etc.; standing side by side with "such another (sectional) church also of Judæa!" Now suppose we cannot yet make a bodily exit out of Babylon, might we not at least begin to learn the language of Canaan? To me it seems that the New Testament warrants only two definite and specific applications of the word church; viz., either (1) to the local assembly; or (2), to the final glorified assembly; in both these uses, the thing itself denoted by the word is realised—the assembly assembles, the congregation congregates; does now, or will do so by and by. All the trouble—all the Babylonish confusion—is about assumed assemblies that never assemble and never can. Just by way of driving off a little of this horrid smoke of the Chaldees, let us ask —Why all this prolonged and feverish anxiety to arrive, prior to the Lord's return, at a Universal Congregation? That the Apostles occasionally wrote in a comprehensive way of "the church of God," meaning thereby the aggregate of Christians then living, I of course do not for a moment deny; my only contention is that those were

Digitized by Google

only general references to the consensus of the Lord's people; and that there is not a particle of evidence to show that in their eye the aggregate church of their day, in the sense explained, either had any organisation or needed any. Instead, therefore, of speaking of "the true church" as having "gone into captivity," as T. W. does, would it not simplify matters wonderfully, if we were to content ourselves by saying: "The true church is in good hands: the Lord himself is forming it; in due time he will finish it, organise it, reveal it, set it in its right place, give its work into its hands, in its power be himself revered, in its perfect beauty be himself admired with great admiration by all orders in his kingdom in the ages to come?"

3. Suppose now we could further agree to ignore utterly all present church organisation save the comparatively simple one of the local assembly, would not this very much narrow the area of remaining difficulty?

4. And now, confronting the final problem, can we not eliminate at least some of the known causes of perplexity? I think we can. *First*, as to "visible communion." T. W. thinks that "twos and threes" "are unable to form visible communions." Did we not know how true it is that we are apt to see only what we look for, we should be tempted to exclaim,—What a remarkable thing! By what evanishing process do "twos and threes" become invisible? But if themselves visible, how is it their "communion" cannot be made so too? Is the breaking of bread an invisible act? Where the twos and threes of the right stamp are to be found, are there not present two or three priests—visible priests competent to perform the visible acts of communion? "But these are not churches." Can we affirm that? What means Matt. xviii. 20 with the coming together *into* the Lord's name (surely a church-constituting act) crowned with the Lord's presence? Not that I plead for little churches: I am only asking whether we have not here an ultimate principle suited for perilous times—a first step out of the city of "Confusion." Then, *secondly*, as to creeds: I am delighted with the intense wistfulness with which T. W. lingers over that beautifully simple, yet significant and immovable confession: "Thou (Jesus) art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." My delight may appear the more natural, if I may be indulged the personal allusion of saying that for four-and-twenty years I have enjoyed Christian fellowship on the basis (so far as *creed* is concerned, be it distinctly observed) of this confession alone. Now, although I do not mean to say that agreement in this confession alone is sufficient for the upbuilding processes and aims of the after Christian life, yet not having found the slightest reason to decline from my long-cherished and passionate conviction of the entire sufficiency of this confession as the convert's creed, upon making which he may and must (so far as creed is concerned) be received into Christian fellowship;—I make bold to ask, why should not "the twos and threes" start

Digitized by Google

out of Babylon at once?—always wishing to be understood as saying: twos and threes *where more cannot be brought to a sufficiently close agreement to walk together.* The one general basis would always have a recuperative and uniting power, perchance almost imperceptibly drawing the happy little groups into larger and still happier bands: groups or bands, what matter? The re-forming of the divinely approved into the all-glorious assembly will be the Master's work—beyond the river.

5. As T. W. is evidently familiar, to the point of unspeakable disrelish, with the jarring dialects of sectarianism, he will not need the shadow of a challenge to find in the above suggestions any trace of the speech of "brethrenism." So-called "Brethren" talk of "the church" in ruins. So that even they are haunted by the nightmare of "the church!" I never heard of their "coming together *into* the name of the Lord"—least of all after the fashion of primitive times.

6. Finally, as regards the question of "solution:" may I crave precise information as to what it is that is proposed to be thrown into solution? If the answer is, "Christianity:" it is obvious to observe that if by "Christianity" be meant post-apostolic dogmas and institutions, it might suffice to let the potsherds of the earth strive with the potsherds of the earth, to grind and solve each other if they can. But where would be the sublimity of *our* going forth to collect them with an ultimate view to precipitation? If, however, by "Christianity" be meant "the faith once for all delivered to the saints," then perhaps it will not be very presumptuous to protest in the first place that "the faith" requires no solution save what it has ever required in the heart and life of every Christian; and secondly that under these circumstances it might appear just a little romantic to be looking out for a theological chemist prepared to do the work of solution for the Christians of a few centuries to come.

JOSEPH B. ROTHERHAM.

24, Fawcett Road, Rotherhithe, London, S.E.

---

## THE PROMISE TO OVERCOMERS.

"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne."—REV. iii. 21.

THIS promise of our Lord to overcomers implies:

1. That his throne is distinct from the throne of his Father upon which he now sits, and

2. That the time is coming when he will vacate it to sit upon his own throne.

These points are important, and highly concern all those who

Digitized by Google

enter the lists for this honour—an honour before which all earthly honour is as the light of the glow-worm before the light of the sun. The one is limited and soon vanishes away, the other is unlimited and continues for ever; so earth's honours are circumscribed and transient; but heaven's honours are uncircumscribed and eternal. And of them all, this is the highest—to sit with the Christ upon his throne!

What is the Throne of Christ?

The title of our Lord, "the Christ," is almost sufficient to give us an answer. It is his official designation, and is synonymous with the titles, "the Messiah," "the Lord's Anointed," and "the King of Israel." These titles indissolubly connect his throne with the nation of Israel. Now what throne has there been in Israel on which the Christ can sit? Let us see.

In 2 Samuel vii. 8-16, we read these words. "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, I took thee (David) from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel. . . . . , Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee an house. And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will raise up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his Father, and he shall be my son. Even in his suffering for iniquity,* I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men. . . . . And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee [*i.e.*, before thy presence in resurrection-life]: thy throne shall be established for ever." This divine oath is thus referred to in Psalm cxxxii. 11, "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David; he will not turn from it; Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne." And so Isaiah, in chapter ix. 6, 7, wrote in anticipation, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

The throne of David is the only throne that has existed in Israel to which God has promised perpetuity; and this perpetuity is bound up in the royal seed of David, of whom God predicated in the above oath, "I will be his Father, and he shall be my Son." And now the question is, Has that Son been born? We all know the answer. That Son—blessed be God!—has been born; and his name is JESUS. God was in very truth his Father (see Luke i. 26-35); but equally was he of the seed of David by his mother

* Dr. Adam Clarke's Translation.

Digitized by Google

Mary. When announcing his birth, the angel Gabriel renewed again to Mary God's ancient promise in the following words, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke i. 32, 33.) Thus, then, the throne of Christ is—

The throne of his father David.

And here we would ask, Where was the throne of David? Was it not on Mount Zion in Jerusalem in the land of Palestine? How unscriptural, then, the theory which teaches that the throne of Christ is in heaven or in men's hearts!

But although Christ's throne—the restored throne of David—is to be located on God's holy hill of Zion (Ps. ii. 6); yet the authority of that throne will be world-wide. All people, nations, and languages shall own his beneficent sway.

"Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad.
Let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof.
Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein;
Then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice
Before the Lord; for he cometh,
For he cometh to judge the earth:
He shall judge the world with righteousness,
And the people in his faithfulness." (Ps. xcvi. 11-13.)

Blessed time! O Christ, haste thy coming! All creation travaileth in pain, waiting for the day of emancipation! And thy Church groans for thy coming! Daily does she cry, Come, Lord Jesus, O come quickly!

When will Christ return to sit upon his throne?

At present our Lord sits upon his Father's throne. He is there as our Advocate and Mediator (1 John ii. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 5). "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Heb. vii. 25). And "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation" (ix. 28). It is certain then that our Lord will return. But when?

In Acts iii. 20, 21, we read, "And he (God) shall send Jesus Christ, which was before preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." Similar testimony is given by the Apostle James in chap. xv. 13-18, "James answered . . . Simeon (*i.e.*, Peter) hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle (*i.e.*, house or throne) of David which is fallen, and I will build again the ruins thereof,

Digitized by Google

and will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." And, says John (Rev. xi. 15), "The seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." These testimonies are very plain. And what do they teach? That—

Christ will return to claim the throne and kingdom of his father David—the throne and kingdom of universal empire—at the end of this dispensation, when his Body—all that shall be overcomers—shall be complete.

With the manner of that return we have not now to do. It may be learned, however, from an examination of Rev. xix. 11-21, and Zech. xiv. 3-21.

David, in Ps. cxxii. 2-5, thus sings of the time subsequent to it:

"Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem!
Jerusalem is builded, as a city that is compact together:
Whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord,
Unto the testimony of Israel,
To give thanks unto the name of the Lord.
For there are set thrones of judgment,
The thrones of the house of David."

And Isaiah writes, "Behold, a King (Christ) shall reign in righteousness, and princes (the overcomers) shall rule in judgment." And adds the beloved John in the Apocalypse, "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment (authority) was given unto them; and they shall reign for ever and ever."

To aspirants for these honours I would say, Behold the throne and kingdom of the Lord Christ, and the time for his entrance thereon!

It is supremely glorious to be co-heirs with the heir of all things, the Lord of life and glory. Let us determine by grace to be overcomers! The way is plain. "Even as I also overcame." We know how Christ overcame, and must follow in his footsteps if we would attain the honour of exercising authority under him in his kingdom—the kingdoms of this world. And if we desire to be near his royal Person, we must be holy and useful, glorifying God by our good works; for the position we shall occupy in his kingdom will be regulated by these. Some will be rulers over ten cities; others over five. "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." Let us, then, "fight the good fight of faith, and lay hold on eternal life." Let us "quit ourselves like men, and be strong." Let us look to ourselves that we "receive a full reward." And the reward is great—very great! —a kingdom, a crown, and eternal life!

C. FOOKS.

Digitized by Google

# THE VISIT OF THE WISE MEN TO BETHLEHEM.

MATTHEW ii.

THIS event is generally associated with the birth of our Lord, and is supposed to have occurred immediately after; but a glance at the careful and accurate narrative given by the evangelist Luke will show that this is absolutely impossible. He informs us that Joseph and Mary were summoned by the decree of Augustus from Nazareth to Bethlehem, where amid the music of angel-song the Christ was born; how, after an eight days' interval, the babe was circumcised; how, after the days of purification according to the Mosaic law, the required sacrifice was offered at Jerusalem; and then we read (Luke ii. 39), "when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, to their own city Nazareth." The days of purification being expressly limited by Moses to thirty-three (Lev. xii.), it follows that within six weeks from our Lord's birth his parents must have entered upon their return journey to their home at Nazareth; and therefore, any such event as the flight and residence in Egypt recorded by Matthew is absolutely shut out from this period and must be fixed later in the life of our Lord. It is quite true that in our English version of Matthew the visit of the wise men appears to be fixed "when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea" (ver. 1); but the definiteness and preciseness of expression thus employed is unnecessary. If we read, as in other translations, "Jesus having been born in Bethlehem," we correctly realise the meaning of the evangelist Matthew, and remove the difficulty. It is thoroughly in accordance with all the probabilities of the case to suppose that during that enforced journey and temporary residence in Bethlehem which Luke records, Joseph may have conceived the idea of making it his home. Charmed, it may be, by the exceeding beauty and fertility of its valleys, the richest in all Palestine, which secured for it the name of Bethlehem, "the house of bread," attracted too by the traditions which lingered around it as their ancestral dwelling place; and still more by the wonderful memories so fresh and vivid of the great event they themselves had witnessed; the parents of our Lord remove from Nazareth and come to Bethlehem; this time not as sojourners, but as permanent residents, and while thus numbered among its inhabitants receive the visit of the Magi.

Such is the supposition to which we are driven by the narrative of Luke; it will be both interesting now, by a little observant study of Matthew's narrative, to ascertain if it will furnish any confirmatory evidence.

And first of all, it is most suggestive to notice the difference in the *residence* of the family as described by the two evangelists. Luke tells us there was no room in the overcrowded inn, and they were compelled to find a resting place for the new born child in a manger, implying, of course, their own sojourn in the same habita-

Digitized by Google

tion, as would probably be the case in a like emergency in the East even to-day. But the narrative of Matthew represents them (ver. 11) as living in a *house*, as if in a settled residence, and clearly, therefore, points to a *different period*. Dr. Thomson, in his valuable work, "The Land and the Book," refers to this statement of Matthew as discrediting the tradition which points to a *cave* in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem as the scene of our Lord's birth. But it is impossible, to our thinking, to refuse credence to this tradition. As the Doctor observes, it can be traced back almost to the time of the Apostle John, and is expressly confirmed by so early a writer as Justin Martyr, who was himself educated in the neighbourhood. Indeed, as the mother of our Lord lived in Palestine, and was found in Jerusalem, when the great triumphs of the Church began, and would frequently be called upon to point out a scene of so much interest, it is almost necessary to suppose it must have been known so widely and with so much certainty, that the tradition must be perfectly correct, and that we may even to-day gaze upon that very spot which once fixed the wondering attention of angel visitants, and tuned their harps to song unheard before. This being so, it is the more satisfactory to find all objection removed, by a knowledge of the fact that the *house* of Matthew ii., to which Dr. Thomson refers, was not the place of the nativity, but the after residence of the family.

Look now at the account given by Matthew of the return from Egypt. Hearing that Archelaus reigned in Judea in the room of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither; clearly implying that such was his *desire*, that in Judea he would fain have fixed his home. Had we indeed the narrative of Matthew only before us, no one would have supposed any other residence for Joseph than Bethlehem, until this period; and we should have wondered why, when unable to return to Bethlehem, he should have chosen so remote a village as Nazareth. The information furnished by Luke gives the explanation. Nazareth had been the home of his boyhood and manhood; and when the new love could not be gratified, to this of course he returns.

Once more, the very time of the visit of the Magi appears to be revealed in Matthew's narrative, and it is, *not* the time of the nativity, but verging upon *two years later* when they first troubled Jerusalem with their strange but not unexpected inquiry (one of the Jewish rabbis having openly stated his belief that the Messiah must appear within the ensuing generation), Herod privately called them, and inquired diligently what time the star appeared; his purpose being, as the after events showed, to ascertain the age of his infant rival. Remembering this, note how his murderous hand is directed (ver. 16). He slew all the children in Bethlehem and its vicinity *from two years old and under*. And as if to remove all possibility of mistake on our part, it is added that this was "*according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men.*"

Digitized by Google

It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that our Lord was at the time verging upon two years of age, and was now living with his parents in their house in Bethlehem, whither they must have removed from Nazareth at some period subsequent to his birth; that birth having taken place during their enforced temporary sojourn two years before, and in the grotto so unhesitatingly pointed out by traditions we cannot reject. Thus again we find in the divergent and apparently contradictory narratives of Scripture history, that real agreement, the "undesigned coincidence," the unity in diversity, which is of so great meaning and value to the honest seeker after truth; and with our faith confirmed and strengthened in the historical truth of our Gospels, we may seek to gather a few of the lessons taught us in this wonderful visit to the infant Christ.

I. Thus early is it made known that Christ is not for a nation, but for the world; not for a narrow community, but for the great deep heart of humanity. This story of his infant years is a foreshadowing of the after proclamation of his gospel, "to the Jew first, but also to the Gentile." Jewish shepherds on Bethlehem's mountain slopes first hear of the new born King, and Jewish saints bid him welcome to the land which shall be his; but ere long Gentile seekers from far off lands thus crowd around him, and claim him as their Lord also. The Jew would have shut the Christ within the boundary of his own tiny land; but his love overleaped the barrier and rolled over the world. Too generally his followers have copied the narrowness of the Jew; erecting around his professing Church ramparts so high that the babes in Christ are effectually excluded, or planting hedges bristling with thorny points of doctrine, admirably adapted to keep out the lambs and let in the wolves. Even to-day there are some whose sole meditation appears to be "strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it;" they find this text very comforting, and they do their best to secure its fulfilment. But Christ flings open his doors; he sounds a universal welcome. Broad as the spacious earth, grand as the encircling heavens, free as the life-giving air,—such is the gospel of Christ. Here Jew and Gentile join hands; Bethlehemite shepherds and Arabian students seek and find one Christ. "The rich and the poor meet together," and find the "Lord is the Maker" and the Saviour "of them all." Glad, bright, and beautiful as the sunlight of heaven; striking first upon the Eastern mountains, then spreading round the world; visiting the mansion of the noble and the cottage of the poor; carrying life and light and joy to every corner of God's great earth,—such is the gospel of Christ.

II. But let us not forget what these wise men did. They *sought* for Christ, and rested not in their seeking until they had found him, and in his humble presence chamber had fallen down and worshipped him. Christ for the world! Yes, but the world must seek him. The careless, the ungodly, and the profane, are often

Digitized by Google

bidden with accents loud and wild gesticulations to "believe," and they shall be saved; Christ would have summoned such to repentance. Not until we feel and know our need, can we approach him; not until, like the wise men, we seek, can we hope to find.

III. But how surely those who seek shall find. They sought in the darkness, but not in vain. Their science was a delusion; their forecasts of human destiny were worthless; but it was all the light they had, and even to this Infinite Pity condescends:—a new star lights the heavens, which to their mystic lore indicated that in Judah the great Deliverer had come. They journey to Jerusalem; Herod hears of their errand, his jealousy, cruel as ever, is aroused, he seeks to discover him they seek, deeming that his puny hand can frustrate the Almighty counsels, and destroy the hopes of centuries. Truly "he that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh, the Lord shall have him in derision." His deep-laid plans issue only in guidance to those who are seeking him he would fain destroy. He sent them to Bethlehem; and lo, the star, reappearing, leads the way, and completes the work he had begun. So is it. A kingdom may be disquieted, a tyrant roused, a nation troubled, a new star shine in heaven; but they who seek must find; and Herod himself be but a finger post to show the way to Christ.

IV. The light of hope and promise gleams for us here in yet another way. They who thus sought and found were *wise* men, the sages, leaders, and philosophers of the people among whom they dwelt; and these knelt in reverence before the Christ. Too often the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God, because arrayed in bitter antagonism to God's chosen king. "Not many wise" are called. Matthew Henry quaintly says that "learned men are too often like Pilate: they put their Latin and Greek over Christ's head instead of under his feet;" and the censure thus pronounced upon one branch of human learning is largely applicable to all. Men who accept with implicit faith the most speculative of scientific dogmas; who upon the fraction of a hair's breadth of fact are ready to build a huge mountain of hypothesis, yet reject the claims of Christ, witnessed by all the centuries, as based upon insufficient evidence. Credulity in the less is balanced by scepticism in the greater. But when the world is Christ's, its wisdom shall be his also. Even philosophy will bend her knee, and her now unwilling hand crown him Lord of all. The ever-increasing learning of the advancing years is but preparing new garlands to deck his kingly brow. When heaven and earth unite to sing, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain," all shall ascribe unto him "riches and wisdom and strength and honour and glory and blessing." Philosophy and science knelt before the babe of Bethlehem, glad earnest of that time when with unhesitating accent and unfaltering tongue the wisdom of all the worlds shall be his.

V. Nor is the promise of the story thus exhausted. Christ welcomed the wise men, the wise men also welcomed the discovery of

Digitized by Google

the Christ. Not for the Jew only but for the world Christ came, and the world shall be his. In his very infancy the promise began to receive its fulfilment. His star flings its light upon Gentile darkness and Gentile sages welcome its beams, foreshadowing the day which is coming. That band of pilgrims shall yet become an army in whose ranks shall be found the myriads of humanity. Christ for the world; yes, and the world for Christ. His fingers fashioned it, his hands sustain it, his blood hath bought it, his power shall redeem it. As the ocean rolling in majesty and grandeur over every atom of its measureless bed; so shall the knowledge of the Lord cover the earth, hiding its sin, removing its curse, destroying its death. We fight the good fight of faith as soldiers in the army, and whatever the vicissitudes of the battle, we know that victory is ours. Tennyson beautifully speaks of "the world's great altar stairs which slope through darkness up to God." Such is the history of man, the destiny of the world. As surely as the storm and hurricane shall give place to the genial warmth of the spring time, as surely as this dead wintry earth shall again blossom into life, as surely as mountain, glen, and woodland shall again be rich with verdure and musical with song, so surely the Lord God shall cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before all the nations. The angel song of Bethlehem shall be sung by a mightier choir, and over wider plains than Judah's; the worship of Bethlehem's visitors shall be repeated by the great world; and a gloria such as earth has never dreamed of, and heaven itself has never heard, shall proclaim the triumph of our king; and so at last the deep sighings of the world shall cease, the groans of creation shall be hushed, and the very wilderness break forth into songs of everlasting rejoicing.

WILLIAM W. SKEMP.
Hampden Villa, Patricroft, Manchester.

---

# "THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY COME TO PASS."

REVELATION i. 1.

No. X.

WE have seen the *two* classes of saved ones pass the scrutiny of the Judgment Seat. The *one* as overcomers having "their works wrought in God" through being "workers together with God." The light of the divine presence, as a fire, has manifested them and their work. Their work has gone into the fire, and come forth as gold, silver, and precious stones. Well has a Puritan writer of the 17th century said, "Have ye that in you that will endure the fire?" "When I am tried I shall come forth like gold." "'Tis the righteousness of God only, not of man, that will endure this trial. 'Tis the divine nature only that can stand before

Digitized by Google

devouring fire, and everlasting burnings. When this day breaks forth all the righteous Pharisees and formalists will be found to be the sinners in Zion that are afraid." (Goad's Sermons, 1653. "*The Right Spirit of Christ.*") And again, "Here is somewhat that is to be devoured in the fire, and somewhat that lives in the fire, that glorifies God in the fire, there is that lives in God who is a devouring fire, and everlasting burnings. All that is spiritual, all that is the new creature, therein it hath its life, it comes from God, and it lives in God" (*Christ the only Sacrifice and Altar*). Dean Alford, in his Commentary on Mark ix. 49, says: "It is with fire all men are to be salted. This fire is the divine purity and judgment in the covenant, whose promise is 'I will dwell among them.' And in and among this purifying fire shall the people of God ever walk and rejoice everlastingly. This is the right understanding of Isaiah xxxiii. 14, 15. 'Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings? He that walketh righteously and speaketh uprightly.'"

The *other* class with their works wrought in self, having lived to self, self in the will, self-indulgent—whether as spendthrifts or covetous—the life-work of such likened to wood, hay, and stubble, we have seen go into the fire, but not go through the fire. "If any man's work shall be burned he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." (1 Cor. iii. 15.) The *man* saved, but the *work* lost, and with it all reward, in the honour and dignity of an entrance richly ministered into the millennial kingdom, or any appointment to rule and authority therein.

## THE FALL OF BABYLON.
## THE MARRIAGE SUPPER OF THE LAMB.

What we now want is for one to say, "Come hither, and I will show thee the judgment of the great harlot that sitteth upon the many waters," (Rev. xvi. 1,) for all seeing, apart from his showing, will profit us nothing. What then *did* John see causing him to wonder with great astonishment? "A woman arrayed in purple and scarlet colour,* and gilded with gold, and precious stones, and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication, and upon her forehead a name written, "Mystery, Babylon the Great, The Mother of the Harlots and of the Abominations of the Earth." And moreover, "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the witnesses of Jesus, sitting upon a scarlet-coloured wild beast full of names of blasphemy." (See Alford.) We note the association of harlotry with blasphemy.

* Simple and unsophisticated minds wonder with astonishment approaching that of John's to see the Roman, the Greek, the Anglican, and one or two other Churches, in robing their priesthood, adopting these very colours that seem to denote this woman's livery.



Digitized by Google

And well might the seer wonder when it was given him to understand that in her he saw the type of the false church *in all ages*, the seed of the bondwoman born after the flesh, persecuting the seed born after the Spirit; the seed of Cain who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother, because his own works were evil and his brother's righteous; the profane seed of Esau which, despising its birthright, has ever sought to slay its brethren, the true seed of Israel; the seed of Balaam, who, with the word of the Lord in his mouth, carried covetousness in his heart, and taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel; the seed of Jezebel, who, though Israel's queen, slew the prophets of the Lord, and threatened the life of Elijah: and in the church of Thyatira, "calling herself a prophetess, yet teaching and seducing God's servants to commit fornication;" the generation at whose hands shall be required the blood of all the prophets which has been shed from the foundation of the world, from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zecharias, which perished between the altar and the temple; the stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, rebuked by the holy martyr, Stephen, in those scathing words, "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost, as your fathers did so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which showed before the coming of the Just One, of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers, who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it." It was these who had received the law, but had not *kept it*, that called forth from our blessed Lord that pathetic lamentation, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!" And then it was that our Lord gave utterance to those remarkable words which confirm what we are now saying. "It cannot be that a prophet perish *outside* of Jerusalem" (Luke xiii. 33). See Alford. Words akin to those of Jeremiah, "Why trimmest thou thy way to seek love? therefore hast thou also taught the wicked ones thy ways. Also in thy skirts is found the blood of the souls of the poor innocents. I have not found it by secret search, but upon all these." (Jer. ii. 33-34.) And those of Hosea, "All their wickedness is in Gilgal, for there I hated them (Gilgal the holy place, the place of worship!) for the wickedness of their doings, I will drive them out of mine house." (Hosea ix. 15.)

This is she whose forehead is inscribed Mystery, having a name to live—the name of Israel in ancient, and Christian in modern times—but dead, being destitute of the spirit that giveth life, having a form of godliness but denying the power. The mystery of iniquity is that which assumes to be what it is not. About iniquity abroad in the world there is no mystery, but when iniquity clothes itself in the guise of sanctity, and either creeps into the

Digitized by Google

church unawares, or seeks to impose upon the church by assumed superiority, what is it but Satan's ministers transformed as the ministers of righteousness, whose end shall be according to their works. Well may she be called Babylon, a synonyme for confusion, wherein good and evil are confused and confounded; the Mother of the Harlots, the spiritual harlotry of all ages, professing herself Jehovah's bride, while destitute of the Spirit of Jehovah, the bride of Christ, while destitute of the Spirit of Christ. In Ezekiel's time they came as the people came, and sat before him as the people of the Lord, with their mouth showing love, but their heart going after their covetousness. In Peter's time they were "spots and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feasted in the church, beguiling unstable souls, their hearts exercised with covetous practices, cursed children." And later still to John in Patmos, the Son of Man describes them as he sees them; in Ephesus, "saying they are apostles, but are liars;" in Philadelphia, "of the synagogue of Satan, who say they are Jews and are not, but do lie." Thus professing espousal to Jehovah while never divorced from Satan, professing espousal to Christ while never divorced from self, wearing sheep's clothing but inwardly ravening wolves, professing love for God while embracing those who hate him. Is she not well named the Mother of the Harlots and of the abominations of the earth? For all the *six* things that the Lord hateth, yea, *seven* which are an abomination to him, are found in her; a proud look, a lying tongue, hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies, and he that soweth discord among brethren. If such a progeny is hateful, what must its progenitor be?

But now has come the time for her judgment, as she shall be found upon the earth at the period under consideration, comprising all churches bearing the Christian name, which have not the Spirit of Christ, and are therefore none of his. Whatever favour the King of Italy might be willing to show the Pope and his cardinals, or whatever favour the Czar of all the Russias might wish to show the Archimandrite and patriarchs, or whatever favour the then ruling power in our own realm might desire to show the bishops and archbishops of our State Church—should we then have one—the *rulers* will be then *overruled*. The power now dominant will be that of a wild beast, "diverse from all that have preceded him, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth shall be of iron, and his nails of brass, devouring, breaking in pieces, and stamping the residue with his feet. His kingdom shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down and break it in pieces." For ages the woman has ridden the scarlet-coloured beast—the emperors, kings, and princes of the earth with whom she has committed spiritual fornication—and the beast with seven heads and ten horns has been willing to carry



Digitized by Google

her *for the service she has rendered to them.* But when God's time shall come to judge *her*, "and avenge the blood of his saints," the beast that has carried her shall grow rampant by reason of her weight, and the oppression wherewith she has in her covetousness and arrogance oppressed the peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues, likened to many waters on which she sitteth. And the ten kings receiving power as kings to reign "one hour with the beast," shall with "one mind give their might and power unto the beast." In that hour "God shall put in their hearts to fulfil his will," and the ten horns and the beast, "these shall hate the harlot, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh"—i.e., appropriate her revenues—"and burn her with fire."

When this shall come to pass, it shall be seen that "The Lord is a man of war" (Ex. xv. 3), as well as the "Prince of Peace" (Isa. ix. 6), and his appearance as a Man of War must precede his appearance as the Prince of Peace. Let our amiable friends imbued with Peace Society's principles, and dreaming that the world will glide smoothly on to a spiritual millennium, *note this.* Before it can be said, "He maketh wars to cease unto the end the earth, he breaketh the bow and cutteth the spear in sunder, he burneth the chariot in the fire," it must be said, "Come, behold the works of the Lord, what desolations he hath made in the earth." (Ps. xlvi. 8, 9.) When Joel's prophecy shall have been fulfilled, "Beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears," (see Joel iii. 9-16,) *then* Isaiah's glowing words shall be verified: "Many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths. And they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." (Isa. ii. 1-5.) But first "the Lord God of Hosts shall make a consumption, even determined in the midst of all the land" (Isa. x. 2, 3), for the destruction of the harlot and the beast which carried her. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire, there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. *Then* shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. (Matt. xiii. 41, 42, 43.) *Then* "shall he cause them that come of Jacob to take root; Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit." (Isa. xxvii. 6.)

But to return. For now shall the overthrow of Babylon be likened to a great city on fire—see Rev. xviii.—when in righteous judgment it shall be said, "Repay to her, even as she repaid, and double unto her double according to her works, in the cup which she mixed, mix for her double. As much as she glorified herself

Digitized by Google

and lived in luxury, so much torment and sorrow give her, for she saith in her heart, 'I sit a queen, and am not a widow, and shall never see mourning.' Therefore in one day shall her plagues come, death, and mourning, and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire, because strong is the Lord God who hath judged her." The beast now rampant, exalting himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, sitting in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God, shall abolish all creeds, expel all bishops from their dioceses, all church dignitaries from their benefices, appropriating their revenues, and if "the smoke of her burning" becomes in any sense literally fulfilled, it will probably be the palaces in which they have glorified themselves and lived in luxury, and the cathedrals, minsters, and churches wherein they have been enthroned as princes of *the Church*. Well may "the merchants, which were made rich by her, stand afar off for the fear of her torment, weeping and wailing, and saying, Alas, alas, that great city Babylon, that mighty city, for in one hour is thy judgment come." And may we not add, "Alas, who shall live when God doeth this?" "But in her is found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that have been slain upon the earth. Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all."

Thus we have seen the fall and destruction of the counterfeit church on earth. It now remains for us to witness the true church in the heavenlies acknowledged and welcomed to the marriage supper of the Lamb.

For after these things "John heard as it were a loud voice of a great multitude in heaven saying, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him both small and great. Hallelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Let us rejoice and exult, and give honour to him, for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready." "And it was given unto her that she should be arrayed in fine linen, bright and pure, for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints," *made theirs* by his having lived in them, and become manifested through them as their life according to that of the Apostle; "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." And to John it was said, "Write, Blessed are they which are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb." And then shall be seen such a mingling of grace with justice and justice with grace as he whose name is Truth alone could apportion; according to his words to the sons of Zebedee: "To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of by my Father;" and concerning those who, unmindful of this country, have desired a better, that is an heavenly, the Apostle to the Hebrews says, "God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he hath prepared for them a city."

A prepared place for a prepared people truly, and well doth it behove us to give diligence *now* that our calling and election may

Digitized by Google

be sure *then*, seeing that only so shall an entrance be richly ministered unto us into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, the inauguration of which we conceive to be the marriage supper now about to be celebrated. For now will come into force and fulness of meaning the words, "They that were *ready* went in with him to the marriage, and the door was shut."

What then can be meant by the marriage supper of the Lamb? It is well understood to be *the feast*—whether the marriage supper of ancient, or the wedding breakfast of modern times—celebrating the nuptials of a wedded pair, a figure with which all men of all ages and all climes have been familiar. High festival is kept for a day, and sometimes for days when such occasions arise, and fleeting as the most perfect joy of such may be,—which alas! is too often marred by some bitterness present or prospective, buried for the time,—the joy of *this* occasion shall be not only absolutely perfect, but absolutely sure and permanent as perfect. Bliss in a sevenfold completeness will then be ours; seeing him, likeness to him, in holiness perfect, in knowledge perfect, in power perfect, with the purest and best of men and angels associated, and lastly, that estate rendered permanent. In what sense we may realise a table spread with bread and wine, and rich fruits of paradise, what "eating bread in the kingdom of God" or "drinking wine new with him in his Father's kingdom" or "twelve manner of fruits yielded month after month by the trees of life growing on either side of the river" may mean, the day must declare. *Only* to see his face and realise his presence will be a feast of joy that will need no festal luxuries to add thereto. He to our then perfected capacity for enjoyment will be meat indeed, drink indeed, a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees well refined. Then shall we sing as never before,

The banquet that we eat
  Is made of heavenly things,
Earth hath no dainties half so sweet
  As our Immanuel brings.

The food's prepared by heavenly art,
  The pleasure's well refined;
They spread new life through every heart,
  And cheer the drooping mind.

A thousand glories to the God
  That gives such joy as this!
Hosanna! let it sound abroad,
  And reach where Jesus is.

Was it a mere accident or a type that our Lord's "beginning of miracles, when he would manifest forth his glory, that his disciples might believe in him," was at a marriage feast? For now shall he be Master of the feast himself, and turning water into wine, "the good wine kept until now," shall say to the servants (possibly angels), "Draw out now, and bear it unto these my brethren."

Digitized by Google

Was this a mere accident, we ask? or were the six water-pots of stone emblems of six thousand years brimful of sin, sadness, and sorrow now turned into joy, in fulfilment of his promise, "Your sorrow shall be turned into joy, I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy none shall take from you?" Yes, they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God, and we shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets there. All the prophets of the Old Testament from Enoch to Malachi, and all the prophets and apostles of the New from John the Baptist to John the seer in Patmos, and such apostolic succession as his eye has seen, who all along the ages has not left himself without witness, many, many links of which have found no place in the pages of human history. What histories, what biographies will that day reveal! written not by poor short-sighted and erring man of his fellow man, but revealed in the light of unerring truth, according to God's estimate of his people's service. Then the least service done to him in the person of one of the least of these his brethren shall in no wise lose its reward. What bliss will that moment bring when face to face we shall see him, no longer with visage marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men, but all radiant with the glory which he had with his Father before the world began. And then to hear his own sweet voice no longer in complaint saying, "What! could ye not watch with me one hour?" but as the voice of our own beloved Bridegroom in tones of music such as sin-cursed earth could never hear. "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations. And I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom."

Well has it been written, "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him;" but since Isaiah's day, by the coming of the Incarnate Son "God hath revealed them in measure—unto us by his Spirit, for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." For then in one grand choir shall we sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying "Great and marvellous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty, just and true are thy ways, thou King of the nations. Who shall not fear thee and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy, for all the nations shall come and worship before thee, because thy righteous acts have been made manifest." And then the refrain of every song of redeemed men, "Unto him that *loveth* us (see Alford), and washed us from our sins in his blood, and he made us a kingdom, even priests unto God and his Father; to him be the glory and the dominion for ever. Amen." And then in grander chorus still, the ascription of praise fitted to the lips of angels too, "Amen! The blessing and the glory, and the wisdom, and the thanksgiving, and the honour,

Digitized by Google

and the power, and the might, be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen."

Let *post*-millenarians note here the form of expression this song of the redeemed and risen ones takes: "all the nations *shall* come and worship before thee," showing this their song to be *pre*-millennial.

And now, with title deeds in hand and wedded to his Bride, the Heir of all things must descend to take possession of his inheritance. In order to which he must gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, must dethrone the usurper Satan, personified in the Man of Sin, the son of perdition, the Lawless One, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. For now at length the promise given at the very dawn of incarnation must be fulfilled: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke i. 32, 33.) The Lord hasten it in his time!

Hackney, London, E. N. STARKEY.

---

# THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION.

BY C. UNDERHILL.

"Behold now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is."—1 JOHN iii. 2.

THE doctrine of Regeneration is one that has been greatly misunderstood in all ages of the Christian Church; Nicodemus is not the only ruler in Israel who has been perplexed by the words of Christ: "Ye must be born again!" Both those who reduce the doctrine to a mere ceremonial observance, imagining that the simple washing of water can make a man a child of God; and those who give to conversion a miraculous character, affirming that then a new life is imparted, and a new nature bestowed, are equally in error: the fact is that regeneration is a matter that affects man's whole being; moral, intellectual, and physical; but the change denoted by this term is not complete, or fully accomplished at conversion; conversion is the incipient stage of regeneration, then the mind and heart are renewed; the believer enjoys the *washing* of regeneration ("and such were some of you, but ye are washed"), his moral relation to God is altered for the better, he is freed from condemnation, and stands in a position of acceptance with God; but the *new nature*, the change of being so essential to a fitness for the heavenly kingdom, is not realised till the second coming of Christ, when the living saints are translated, and the dead in Christ raised incorruptible, and in every respect conformed to the image of their Lord; "for we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." (1 Cor. xv. 51.) Scripture clearly dis-

Digitized by Google

tinguishes between these two stages or crises in the history of regeneration, and it is the confounding of these that has made the subject so incomprehensible, and has led to a great deal of doctrinal error; a change of *nature* is a miracle; give conversion a miraculous character, and you place it beyond the reach of what may be accomplished by moral influences, and relieve men of all responsibility whether they become the subjects of this change or not.

1. In considering this subject, we propose first to place side by side the words of Christ (John iii. 6), and the words of the apostle Paul (1 Cor. xv. 50), and show that the subject of discourse is in each case the same; and that the new birth *de facto* is accomplished at the resurrection from the dead. Paul affirms that Christ, as the second Adam, stands at the head of a new creation; that as man's present nature is the result of his connection with the first Adam, so those who are joined to Christ must ultimately partake of a new and spiritual nature; "that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterwards that which is spiritual; the first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven: As is the earthy such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly, and as we have borne the image of the earthy we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, *that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God:* neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." These statements are in perfect accord with the words of our blessed Lord. (John iii. 6.) "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit he *cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* That which *is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit:* Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again" (or from above). Man must partake of a new and heavenly nature, or he cannot enter the kingdom of God, and this new and heavenly nature is, as we see by the words of the Apostle, bestowed at the time of the second coming of Christ, and not at conversion.

2. It is an undeniable fact that *man's nature is not changed* at conversion. The sum total of the change at conversion is *moral* and not *physical:* man physically and intellectually is the same being as before; no new faculty or power has been conferred upon him; as a moral agent he is influenced by moral considerations, actuated by moral motives, the faculties and powers he possesses become at conversion consecrated to God: "Knowing," says the Apostle, "the terrors of the Lord, we *persuade* men:" the motives presented by the Gospel are pressed home by the energy of the Holy Spirit, but the *nature* of the man who is the subject of these influences, is still the same: the same sinful tendencies; the same appetites and passions both of body and of mind; the same moral weakness, except so far as he lays hold upon the strength of Christ. So says the Apostle: "With the mind, I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin:" indeed, the presence of this sinful nature is the curse of the renewed man. "O wretched man, that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" To teach, therefore, that man's nature is changed at conversion is to teach what is contrary to fact.

3. Further, it is a fact, an incontrovertible fact that the Christian man's nature is radically changed at the resurrection from the dead;

Digitized by Google

*then*, he is literally born again; he receives a new life, an eternal life that shall never end; indeed, the same words that are used in Scripture to express natural birth, are also employed to express this spiritual birth from the grave (John xviii. 37). The Saviour speaking of his first *birth*, says: "To this end was I born (γεγέννημαι), and for this cause came I into the world." The Apostle Paul uses the same word in describing the resurrection of Christ (Acts xiii. 33): "Thou art my Son, this day have I *begotten* (γεγέννηκά) thee;" at the first birth of the Virgin Mary, the Saviour took hold upon the nature, not of angels, but of the seed of Abraham, and was made in all points like unto his brethren, sin excepted; the resurrection from the dead was a spiritual birth; "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body;" our Lord was begotten from the dead to die no more: "I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore. (Rev. i. 18.) Again, Christ is the head of the body, the Church: "who is the beginning, the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. (Col. i. 18.) The same word is used of the Saviour's first birth: Mary brought forth her firstborn (πρωτότοκον) son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger." Again (Rev. i. 5), "Jesus Christ the faithful witness and the first begotten (πρωτότοκος) of the dead:" also (Rom. viii. 29), "the firstborn (πρωτότοκον) among many brethren." We see, therefore, that the Scriptures frequently speak of the resurrection to life as a new birth; it has been participated in by Christ, and *first* by Christ, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence; so likewise the many brethren must also be born again, or begotten from the dead, that they too may bear the image of their Lord. The emphasis of the words of Christ to Nicodemus is significant: "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again: except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." The Platonists have so completely ignored the doctrine of the resurrection that they have misunderstood the necessity of this new birth; *they* teach that the unclothed spirit can enter the kingdom of heaven, and can see and enjoy the glory of Christ; Christ teaches, "Ye must be *born again*," or ye cannot see the kingdom of God. Which is the true teacher, Christ, or Plato? A man must be born of water and of *the Spirit;* the resurrection of the believer in Christ, is the peculiar prerogative of the Holy Spirit: "If the Spirit of him that *raised up Jesus from the dead* dwell in you; he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." (Rom. viii. 11.) Again, this new birth is compared to the wind: "Thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." The movements of Christ after his resurrection were very mysterious; he appeared and disappeared as in a moment; these qualities it may be, pertain to the spiritual body, "so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Further: it was essential that Christ should be the *first* to partake of this spiritual birth; the Christian realises it only as connected with Christ; *Christ* is the origination and source of this life, which from its very nature is eternal; consequently, we read of Christ (Col. i. 15): "He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) of

Digitized by Google

every creature;" and again (Acts xxvi. 23), "that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the *first* that should rise from the dead." Many persons have been restored to natural life by Christ and by his servants; but Christ was the *first* to partake of this spiritual life, or new creation. "He was the faithful and true witness, the *beginning of the creation of God*" (Rev. iii. 14.) The case of Enoch, and also of Elijah, may seem to present a difficulty; but there is nothing to show but what the phenomenon presented may be simply the preservation of their natural lives; especially if Elijah be one of the two witnesses who is to suffer death under Antichrist. (See Rev. xi. 7.) Christ in resurrection is declared to be the "*firstborn* among many brethren," and also the "firstfruits of them which sleep:" these words are emphatic, and are decisive of the question.

4. These two crises in regeneration, the moral change at conversion, and the change of nature at resurrection, are in perfect accord with the general statements of Scripture. Any apparent discrepancy is at once resolved by a consideration of the fact that the Word of God often speaks of the privileges of the believer proleptically, that is, by way of anticipation; or, as we may say, *de jure*, and not *de facto*: for instance, "If any man be *in* Christ, he is a new creature" (or new creation, 2 Cor. v. 17); the apostle says *in Christ, not in himself*, speaking representatively; *in Christ*, the believer representatively is already a partaker of the new creation, and may be said to be risen with Christ, "and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus" (Eph. ii. 6). Christ as the representative of the Church is seated in the heavenlies; his people in him are, *representatively* sitting with him. There are many passages of the like character. So with the class of passages that describe the Christian as born of God, "Every one that loveth is born (γεννάω) of God" (1 John iv.), &c.: these passages refer to the incipient stage of regeneration, *the begetting*, as the word properly denotes, the full development of the change being realised only at the second coming of Christ, when those who are predestinated to be conformed to his image, see Christ, and are *like* Christ.

5. The practical bearing of this subject is of the highest importance; it is to feared that the work of evangelisation has been sadly hindered by mistaken views of the nature of conversion. If conversion be a miraculous change; if the terms, new life, spiritual life, or a new nature, as applied to this change, be intended to denote a fundamental alteration in man's being; then repentance and faith are lifted out of the category of moral influences, and the sinner is robbed of his essential characteristic, that of a moral and responsible being; this no doubt is the teaching of the hyper-Calvinist, but such conclusions are alike repugnant both to reason and revelation. Let there be a clear distinction made between the two great crises in regeneration, and the matter at once becomes intelligible: nature teaches us by analogy that there is first the conception or the begetting and afterwards the birth or deliverance of the child; so conversion is the incipient stage of regeneration, which issues at the resurrection in the full development of the spiritual man. May every reader of these remarks be a partaker of this new birth, when the earth shall labour to bring forth her spiritual children. "Who hath heard

Digitized by Google

such a thing? who hath seen such things? Shall the *earth be made to bring forth in one day?* or shall a nation be born at once? for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children" (Isaiah lxvi. 8). "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness, from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth." (Psalm cx. 3.)

---

## THE FIRST CHRISTMAS CAROL.

THE song of the angels was heard long ago,
And still it is ringing to mortals below;
It comes from a fount which must aye overflow.
Hallelujah!

'Tis "Glory to God in the highest!" they sing,
And harps that are fann'd by the heavenly wing
Awake a like strain from each trembling string.
Hallelu

"Peace, peace on the earth, and goodwill unto men,"
Let all the wide echoes repeat it again,
While swells the loud chorus, "Amen and amen."
Hallelujah!

Behind the blue veil now the cherubim wait,
Till sounds the glad signal to "lift up the gate,"
And they with The King shall appear in His state.
Hallelujah!

Oh! "bless'd are all they who are waiting for Him!"
On earth, where the shadows fall heavy and dim,
Or mid the bright glories of high seraphim.
Hallelujah!

*The star of the morning!* how sweet to the eyes,
That sat long in darkness, His beauties arise,
Illuming the path that's "above to the wise."
Hallelujah!

*The Day* is at hand, though we see not the sun,
Behold, o'er the mountains His streaks have begun,
The Light and the Life—His full course he shall run.
Hallelujah

Up, up, like the lark, then, and carol thy lay,
*A Prince and a Saviour* is given for aye,
Let heaven and earth hail His glorious Day.
Hallelujah!

By Mrs. Joseph Fearn,
Author of *Plain Rhymes on the Pentateuch*, &c. &c.

Hastings, 1878.

Digitized by Google

# THE SECOND PSALM: A PROPHETIC POEM.

(1) WHEREFORE have nations *come crowding together?* (*a*)
Or should RACES (*b*) be muttering (*c*) an empty thing?
(2) The kings of the earth *are taking their stand*,
And DIGNITARIES (*d*) have sat in council together,
Against Jehovah, and against his Anointed One:—
(3) "Let us break asunder their bands,
And cast away from us their cords!"

(4) HE WHO IS SEATED IN THE HEAVENS (*e*) will laugh,
THE LORD (*f*) will mock (*g*) at them;
(5) THEN will he speak unto them in his wrath,
And, in his glowing anger, put them in terror:—
(6) "Yet *I* have appointed (*h*) my King
On (*i*) Zion, (*k*) the hill of my holiness!"

(7) Let me rehearse a statute! (*l*)
JEHOVAH (*m*) hath said unto me:—
"*My son* [art] *THOU!*
*I*, this day, have begotten thee: (*n*)

---

*a* "*To come together in heaps*, or *masses, to combine in a mass* . . . A meaning *to rage, be tumultuous*, is not proved in Hebrew" (Fürst).

*b* Synonymous with "nations" in line 1. The Authorised Version almost always loses the vividness with which the Hebrew speaks of Gentile nationalities in the plural—to the serious obscuring of the prophetic word.

*c* Lit., *to utter deep tones*, used of the lion, of thunder, of the magician; also of the dove, and of the righteous man's soliloquy in Jehovah's law (Psalm i. 2).

*d* Lit., weighty ones.

*e* The participial construction—here used with telling emphasis: it "presents the action as *lasting*, as a state or condition" (Ewald), in fine contrast with the futile activity of earth's kings and peoples.

*f* Adonai, one who is really sovereign.

*g* Imitating their barbarous language, and throwing it at them in derision.

*h* Or, "anointed;" but in this authorities are not agreed, hence it seems safer to keep to the generic meaning.

*i* Or, "over:"—"Zion is mentioned as the royal seat of the Anointed One; there he is installed, that he may reign there, and rule from thence, cx. 2. It is the hill of the city of David (2 Sam. v. 7, 9; 1 Kings viii. 1), including Moriah, that is intended" (Delitzsch).

*k* "Sunny" (Gesenius, Davies): "tower, fortress, fort" (Fürst). The name of the south-western hill of Jerusalem; the older and higher part of the city. "Zion is universally used by poets and prophets for Jerusalem" (Fürst).

*l* Prop. something marked in, engraved: gen. rendered "statute" in Authorised Version. This word stands in fine contrast with the lawlessness of the kings of earth, many of whom are self-appointed. Comp. Psa. xlv. 5; Heb. v. 5. The verb in this line is in the "cohortative" mood, which "expresses more strongly the direction of the will"—it is the mood of "self-admonition and self-excitation," and is used "also when the will of the speaker is under external compulsion" (Ewald). Thus it appears as though the Anointed One were constrained by the hateful lawlessness opposed to him to proclaim aloud the ground of his right to the throne. How unlike the lawless one! (2 Thess. ii.)

*m* Notice the point as shown by the emphasis. "JEHOVAH has said it: it is not an assumption of my own."

*n* Or, "given thee birth." Like the Greek γεννάω, the Hebrew *yâladh* broadly covers the entire parental relation. The context may determine it to "begotten"

Digitized by Google

(8) Ask of me, and let me give (*o*)
Nations as thine inheritance,
And, as thy possession, the ends of the earth:
(9) Thou wilt break them with a sceptre (*p*) of iron,
As the vessel of a potter, wilt thou dash them in pieces."

(10) So NOW, ye kings, show discretion, (*q*)
Be admonished, ye judges of earth:
(11) Serve Jehovah with fear,
And exult with trembling;
(12) Kiss the son, lest he be wroth, and ye perish by the way—
For his wrath *may soon kindle!*— (*r*)
Oh, the blessedness of all who take refuge in him!

The poetical character of the Psalms is universally acknowledged. Were it otherwise, a little care to exhibit them in due form so as to bring out to the eye the parallelisms and stanzas into which they naturally fall must force their poetic element upon the notice of the most casual reader. In the sample now before us we have poetry of the highest order. Brilliancy of expression and beauty of imagery are here conspicuous, as subservient at the same time to the higher qualities of bold grouping, dramatic movement, and sudden transition. Similar objects are brought together at one view: one scene is removed that another may appear: simultaneous events are exhibited in succession, for convenience or for effect: banished actors return to contribute something more to the final result: the slow growth of causes is quickened at once into the ripened harvest that the gain of the whole season under survey may be garnered before our eyes.

It is plain that such a composition demands careful handling on the part of the expositor, especially when the poem is at the same time a prophecy. It stands to reason that every document should be interpreted after its kind—according to what it is. It is enough, for example, that a proverb be proverbially true. In like manner, it should suffice that poesy be verified in nature and life in a style harmonious with its peculiar calling. It were manifestly unfair to expound as prose what was conceived as poetry.

All prophecy, whether poetical or not, requires careful and cautious treatment, since it were unreasonable to expect it to be in any case a formal, anticipatory chronicle of historical details. No prophecy of the

---

in one place and "brought forth" in another; but now and then it is incongruous to determine it either way—as here when our Lord's resurrection is to be thought of (Acts xiii. 33).

*o* Again the "cohortative" mood: see note *l*.

*p* As in Psalm xlv. 6. It seems important to bring this out, as setting forth the kingliness of the act. The straight sceptre is also a strong one: mighty to protect the obedient, it is equally so to destroy the disobedient. The shepherd's relation to the sheep involves that which he sustains to the wolf.

*q* The better part of valour—with such a prospect!

*r* And yet how mercy lingers, wooing and warning. Moreover, the mere fact that this admonition is tendered at all suggests a qualification not expressed in ver. 9; though even there it might well have been thought that the inheritance would scarcely be destroyed as soon as received.

Digitized by Google

Scripture "turns out to be self-solving" (ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται, 2 Pet. i. 20). The *solution*, in the full sense of that word, is not private to itself, but must come from beyond itself,—from comparison of similar prophecies, and especially from fulfilment.

Thus a prophetic poem imposes on the reader a double caution: it is poetry and it is prophecy, and on each account must be interpreted with care.

And yet these considerations must not be pressed too far. Even poetic language may be unambiguous as far as it goes; for it is by no means just to conclude that figures of speech are essentially misleading, especially when it is remembered that nearly every good figure shines in its own light. Children may freely attribute life to inanimate objects: their parents are seldom misled. Why should a picture for the ear be of less obvious meaning than one for the eye? The same picture may speak with equal plainness to peoples of many tongues. Glancing at the psalm before us, we may make bold to inquire what excuse we could offer, were we to confound a "sceptre of iron" with a "message of love" or a "scoff" with a "kiss," or were we to convert a smashed "potter's vessel" into a symbol of spiritual transformation! Then, too, we need feel no strong enticement to use private interpretation in studying the composition before us. This Second Psalm is a public document. It is one of many similar public documents. We have a number of prophetic poems not greatly unlike this one—all pervaded by a common sympathy, instinct with a common life. These we can lay side by side. What one does not tell us another may. Moreover, all prophecies are not psalms: some are plain prediction scarcely coloured with metaphor. Besides which the current of fulfilment has set in. This Psalm, for example, has already struck its roots into history. In fact we have in our possession apostolic comments on the initial accomplishment of parts of the poem.

From all which it follows that as we ought not to be rash, so neither need we be timid, in our studies of this divine composition. Turning to it, thus reassured, we see standing out in bold relief upon its surface—the Gathering of the Nations, the Enthronement on Zion, and the Rehearsal of the Statute. To each of these let us briefly attend.

I. *The gathering of the nations.* As soon as we look over the first stanza of this Psalm we perceive in it a great breadth of reference. As we observe the mention of "nations" and "races," "earth's kings" and their "dignitaries" assembled "in council," we feel that the language is fitted to describe a conspiracy of vast magnitude—one assuming world-wide proportions. When we advance to the second stanza, this impression is strikingly confirmed. The scornful laugh of the heavenly King brings out the fulness of the contrast: it is heaven against earth, and therefore earth against heaven. The first vision, therefore, is that of the world in arms. Everything, down to the very end of the psalm, confirms the correctness of this view. When in the third stanza the voice of the heaven-appointed King is heard, it is found that he prefers claims to dominion far outmeasuring the limits of Zion or the delightsome land of which it is the capital; reaching, in fact, right away to "the ends of the earth." And finally, the fourth stanza, with its admonition to the "kings" and "judges of earth," maintains this cosmic

Digitized by Google

extent of survey. The natural meaning of the psalm gives a world-wide comprehensiveness to the conspiracy which here at the outset arrests our attention. Subject to any authoritative limitations which may be found to have been laid on this universality, we are bound to keep to this interpretation. We do not plead for the slavishly literal exposition of the Bible: we plead, and strongly plead, for the unbiassed, the obvious, the natural. Unnatural interpretation is to be resolutely avoided.

In regard of the matter in hand we do not forget that we are dealing with prophecy thrown into a poetic form. For that very reason, however, we are cautioned against two things: first, against pressing for circumstantial details,—as here, against being too anxious to know *when* and *where* and *how* this cosmical conspiracy will take place; and, second, against allowing the general impression to be wiped out of our minds. At all events this is a confederation of nations on a large scale. No want of details should blind us to this; for this is apparently one of the few leading conclusions which the psalm was intended to make plain.

Granted, again, that we are dealing with prophecy, and that this should put us on our guard against "private interpretation." What effect should the remembrance of this have on our minds? The answer is, That it should lead us to recognise in the psalm the Public Spirit of prophecy; that is, the Foreseeing Spirit of God, the Spirit of the Messiah (1 Pet. i. 11), the Spirit of the Future, the Spirit of the Ultimate Kingdom of righteousness and peace. Away into this future were the holy men of old borne along (*φερόμενοι*). The eagle of prophecy is not to be chained to the rock of contemporary history, though he may rise therefrom when starting for his long and lofty flight. Those details of date and occasion, which are all very well in their way, but for which some crave with an eagerness which is born of blindness to the true functions of prophecy, are not always of much importance. Sometimes, indeed, they are needless; and hence, as in this very example, the Second Psalm, they are not given. What does it matter? Away beyond this small canopy of cloud which shuts in the Present, the eagle shall gaze upon the Sun of the Future,—possibly also shall descry dark storms looming afar which must come and burst upon us before that Sun shall shine here with broad, undimmed light.

What is meant hereby? This: that it is proper to ask whether prophecy elsewhere knows of such a coming storm of rebellious confederation between the kings and races of earth against Jehovah and his King-for-earth as that we here see portrayed. It is notorious that it does. Prophecy does elsewhere depict a similar conspiracy. Out of many instances, two or three may be cited; viz., Ezek. xxxvii.-xxxviii.; Zech. xii.-xiv.; Rev. xvii.-xix. In the last named chapter (ver. 15), by the way, the very words of this psalm are quoted.

Hence, then, we see the propriety of retaining the conviction, begotten by the very terms of this inspired composition, that they set forth a conspiracy against Jehovah and his Christ such as has never been witnessed. They point to a culmination of lawlessness, to a crowning manifestation of rebellion.

We have not forgotten how this portion of Scripture was used by the

Digitized by Google

Primitive Church (Acts iv.) in her troubles. Since, however, the greater contains the less, and in the less the greater is reflected; since the power and love divine that are sufficient to bring God's people through the final fiery ordeal are surely sufficient to bring them through all the foretastes of that ordeal; on these principles we can well understand how fitted was the Second Psalm to encourage the persecuted believers in Jerusalem, without attributing to them the conclusion that the confederate rebellion had then attained its full development. A foretaste of it they had, in that league of ambitious Roman and degenerate Jew: how long it might be ere it should assume full prophetic proportions, and go on to do its worst, and then be overthrown for ever, by the conversion of the foes into the footstool of the Appointed King,—this it was not given them to know.

II. *The Enthronement of Zion.* As the first stanza of this poem rises to a climax in the very words of the rebellious kings of earth—words wherein the venom of their defiance is expressed; so the second stanza reaches its highest point in the very words of heaven's serene and victorious King. *They* have issued *their* manifesto: *He* proclaims *His*. The subject of dispute is THE EARTH—*how and by whom it shall be governed*. They claim to rule it as they list—in violation of the bonds of right and the cords of truth: these being fetters which they would fain break asunder that nothing would be left as a restraint on their godless, lawless, selfish wills. They seem to know how desperate is the position they desire to stand in, how Jehovah frowns upon their project, and has other designs for earth's good governing centring in his own Anointed One. So they join in their vain enterprise, that they may keep each other in countenance. They appear to be aware of the boldness of their intentions, and therefore take every precaution to strengthen themselves in it: call their wisest counsellors, as well as their bravest generals, to their aid; that to the power of numbers they may add the craft of diplomacy. With such combination, consultation, and determination, do they send their programme forth. After all, they can only declare what they *would wish to do;* for in truth it is no easy thing for LAWLESSNESS to REIGN.

But Jehovah has not been surprised: his heavenly throne still stands unmoved. He only waits the moment approved by his own wisdom to overthrow the conspiracy. He laughs in holy greatness and assurance at the futility of their scheme: he mocks, in derisive mimicry, the Babel speech which prevails in their counsels, and throws back at them their chattering words of childish treason. They have a plot: he has a counterplot; and once his counterplot is revealed so they cannot mistake it, they will be smitten with dismay, terror will lay hold upon them. They, forsooth, have said what they *would wish to do:* he announces WHAT HE HAS DONE ("Yet *I* have appointed my King," &c.) Their kingship is forfeited; for have they not abused it to their uttermost? Have they not refused to accept of heaven's imperial sway, so far as they can order it otherwise? at least they will do their utmost to violate Jehovah's holy laws. Their kingship is forfeited; and now that heaven proceeds to act, they know their rule is doomed. They hear their own death-knell when they hear the manifesto of God. Jehovah, ere they are aware, has appointed his own king—one, of whom he says: "This



Digitized by Google

is 'my King.'" They, as they know to their terror, are kings no more. They tremble, as well they may, in prospect of the wrath of earth's Elect King.

Here again we come upon the unfulfilled. This counterplot of heaven has not yet been unveiled to the dismay of earth's godless kings. For, be it well observed, this revelation, *as described in the Psalm*, is not made to faith but to sight. The voice of the King of kings is heard by the kings themselves, when they are engrossed in their rebellion. They hear—not by faith, for they are unbelievers; but they hear because they cannot help hearing. Much against their minds they see and know that they are the laughing-stock of heaven: they are surprised, they are overtaken, they are unmasked, they are undone—they know it. And this in spite of all their cherished unbelief.

*We* now read this Psalm, and believe it. Granted; but that is not to the point. The point is, that wholly irrespective of whether these confederate kings have read that old Hebrew hymn called Psalm the Second, or have known of such ancient poems, or have ever heard of a Bible, or cared for any so-called Holy Writings;—the point is, that irrespective of any such considerations, these rebels are overtaken in their rebellion by the direct and manifest countermovement of heaven. They tremble in dismay to find it so. The whole spirit and burden of this prophecy immovably settle this point.

And thus the question of *locality* is fairly thrown open—the local centre for the Monarchy designed by Heaven for Earth. It appears to have an appointed centre. The very terms of Jehovah's proclamation give it one.

> "Yet *I* have appointed my king
> On Zion, the hill of my holiness."

What means this? Is Zion no locality at all? Or being one, is it not on earth anywhere? Is Zion—this Zion—described as by a familiar title—in heaven?

The question, we say, is open. Had the conspiracy been in fact now blasted, and the predicted monarchy inaugurated,—in the manner and with the results here set forth, then perhaps the question might have been foreclosed. Knowing of no such enthronement on any earthly Zion, we might have been driven to the supposition of a heavenly.

But are we so driven while yet fulfilment lingers? May we even dare to come to such a surprising conclusion?—for surprising we must soon perceive it to be, very surprising. Would the adoption of that conclusion be such a dutiful and steady holding of the prophetic lamp for the guidance of our feet as our beloved Peter has commended us to? Assuredly, we believe it would not. We believe that there are reasons why we cannot identify this holy hill of Zion with the locality of Jehovah's universal throne in the third heavens. If, indeed, any sane man could look through the Book of Psalms, particularly observing how the term "Zion" is used, and thereby discover that Mount Zion is in heaven, the case would be altered. But is this possible? We are persuaded it is not.

Only note what things are said of "Zion," and judge whether these can apply to any place or state above this earth. To keep as far as possible away from "private interpretation," let us glean a few hints

Digitized by Google

from "Isaiah" as well. We read, then, in the Psalms, of the captivity of "Zion," (cxxvi. 1), and of the captives in Babylon remembering "Zion" (cxxxvii. 1); of Jehovah having mercy on "Zion," and building "Zion" (cii. 13, 16); of the beautiful situation of "Zion," and the gathering of the kings of the earth to behold her with the result to them of consternation and flight (xlviii. 2-6); of Jehovah's "there" breaking arrows, shield, sword, and battle (lxxvi. 1-3); of "Zion" as chosen to be Jehovah's dwelling place, and made such with the co-operation of his people (cxxxii. 13, 14, 3-8). Is this "Zion" located in the skies? Then in Isaiah we find "Zion" spoken of as purged from her dross, her judges restored as at the first, and she redeemed with judgment (i. 25-27); we find a remnant left in "Zion," and her daughters purged from filth by the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning (iv. 3, 4); we find Jehovah reigning in "Mount Zion" before his ancients gloriously, not as if away in distant worlds, but as if under the eye of the sun and of the moon, and thus, by his glory, putting those earth-illumining and earth-ruling orbs to shame (xxiv. 23); we find Him in the same "mountain" making a feast for all "peoples" and "nations" of the "earth" (xxv. 6, 7); we find "Zion" in her sorrow concluding that Jehovah has "forsaken" and "forgotten" her, and amazed at the removal of her captivity (xlix. 14-21); we find her, indeed, "forsaken," but then made "an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations" (lx. 15). One would think that here, without going farther, are marks enough of identity; and that it is as impossible to apply these marks to any place or state away in the heavens, as it is to find them meeting in any assembly or number of assemblies of Gentile believers. They point to Jerusalem in Palestine and nowhere else. They refer to the city in which David was king, over which the Son of David wept—which the Romans besieged—but which shall yet be rebuilt, restored, beautified, and honoured by the presence and throne of her only rightful and now immortal King.

The place of enthronement, then, is on earth; and the time of enthronement is to come. The voice of Jehovah, which is yet to be heard announcing the accomplished fact of enthronement supposes some installation of the Messiah into His office as King of earth, which has not yet taken place. We have, indeed, the Psalmist's fore-intimation of that voice; he has disclosed to us what it will say. But the voice itself as the psalm leads us to conceive of it, has not yet spoken. When it does speak, it will proclaim something just accomplished on earth: it will address the confederate kings: they will hear what it says, and will know it to be true: they will realise that they are mocked by Heaven, and that their doom has come. And they will tremble.

III. *The Rehearsal of the Statute.* A plot may be ripened before it is divulged; and, therefore, the futurity of the great collision does not imply any tardiness of preparation. He that is seated in the heavens will not be taken by surprise. The wonder at last will be that all emergencies had been provided for—every need anticipated. "Wanted—a King," may be advertised by perplexed peoples and diplomatists, but no such admission will ever again be made by Heaven. It has been needless ever since Jesus of Nazareth rose from the dead. It is a fact well known to our faith, though wholly concealed from the world by the sheer force of its own unbelief, that the Emperor of the Heavens has a



Digitized by Google

King for this earth by him in reserve; and that this King in Reserve is His own Only Son, who for the last eighteen centuries has been waiting for the time appointed of his Father. As this Royal Son possesses the powers of an indissoluble life he does not grow old.

And here we touch the link that holds together the second and third stanzas of this psalm. That ended with kingship: this begins with sonship.

The kingship is based on the sonship; the sonship is the claim to the kingship. "My King," says the sixth verse: "My Son," says the seventh.

Jehovah has a right to place His own Son on David's throne, when His own Son is David's son as well. *This*, indeed, is faithful as well as right.

But the sonship is repeated by the Son from his Father's lips, and when repeated is given forth as a statute. This is indeed remarkable. Let the reader try to do justice to this peculiarity. Let him observe well that he does not, in this connection, hear the Messiah's voice, saying: "I will announce a fact,—I am Jehovah's Son." Nor does he hear it saying: "I will announce a fact: Jehovah has said unto me, 'Thou art my Son.'" No; but, "Let me rehearse a statute," &c.

In truth, the explanation is not far to seek. Rather, it stands a chance of being overlooked because it is so near at hand.

Bring this third stanza of the psalm into connection with the two foregoing, and the reason is at once disclosed why it is that the Messiah should proclaim his own divine sonship, not merely as a fact resting on his own word, but as a statute, and that statute as made up of a quotation from the lips of the most fitting speaker—the Divine Father. Obviously, "the most fitting speaker;"—for who so fitting as a kingly father to bring his own son out into public recognition?

The Father says, in substance: "Thou art my Son; and being such, I designate thee to this vacant throne, located in Zion as the metropolis of the earth. Seated thereon, and reigning from thence, THOU shalt be Monarch of Earth." Such an Imperial Salute is in effect a Statute.

The moment we see this point of connection, the whole becomes self-evident.

We grasp the connection between the third stanza and the second, and perceive how both, with combined effect, tell upon the first. There is a vital unity between them all, including the fourth.

We see how thoroughly the confederate kings are mocked, and with what good reason they are terrified.

We see the relation of "Zion" to those Kings and to the Earth they have misgoverned.

We see how the invitation given by Jehovah to His Son to ask for all the earth springs out of the sonship of the Son.

We see why the kings and judges should be exhorted to kiss the Son, and dread his soon-roused ire.

And, finally, we see an exquisite beauty and feel a far-reaching force in one delicate feature thrown into the third stanza by the psalmist, namely, the decided and highly significant emphasis which he lays on the word "Jehovah" in the seventh verse.

The more ordinary arrangement of words in Hebrew is for the verb

Digitized by Google

to precede its nominative: when this is reversed, and the nominative precedes its verb, the arrangement is highly significant, the noun being thereby thrown into bold, antithetic prominence. We are indebted to *Ewald* for calling attention to this fact.

In the case before us, the noun "Jehovah" stands before the verb "has said." Consequently, an appreciative feeling should be expressed in the utterance of the former word. "JEHOVAH"—"it is HE that has said it—no less, no other than HE." How fine, how inexpressibly rich the contrast hereby struck forth into relief between the lawless kings of earth and the obedient and loyal Son of God, of whom it is elsewhere said, "Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest lawlessness!"* As much as to say: "By no plotting of self-will, by no acceptance of any call from scheming statesmen or frenzied crowds, do I ascend this throne. I glorify not MYSELF in being made a King. I only acquiesce in the will of Jehovah. It is he who, saluting me as his Son, has designated me to this throne."

We must not leave this extremely significant verse without noting the circumstance that it is quoted three times in the New Testament. First, it appears in Acts xiii. 33, in such a manner as to identify the Birthday of the Statute with the day of the Messiah's rising from the dead. He was re-born from a virgin tomb to reign over a redeemed earth; and reign over it he will, though for the present he has disappeared in the skies. Then it stands, in Heb. i. 5, in a context which teaches that the preferment denoted by his resurrection set the Messiah in a higher rank than all the heavenly messengers of God. And, finally, it is quoted in Heb. v. 5, with the very same emphasis thrown on the speaker of the words, "Thou art my Son," &c., as that above indicated as lying in the very arrangement of the words of the psalm; with this difference, however, that whereas the direct implication in the psalm is that the Messiah did not glorify HIMSELF in being made KING, in Heb. v. the implication is that he glorified not HIMSELF in being made Priest. Whether the latter is to be regarded as involved in the former, or merely as an accommodation of the principle therein seen, may be an interesting inquiry; but it would demand a fuller investigation into the bond between the Kingship and Priesthood of Messiah than would be appropriate here.

Our space is exhausted: certainly not our theme; since we must leave untouched the startling question, Has the Messiah yet asked for his inheritance? (ver. 8), and the scarcely less interesting one, Will he wholly destroy his inheritance as soon as he gets it, or indeed at any time after? This only can we say, taking a final glance on into the fourth stanza, that while we clearly see how beautifully the end of the psalm folds back on the beginning by the re-introduction of the "kings" and "judges," the divine appropriateness of the end is wonderfully commended to us as we mark how mercy even here would fain rejoice over judgment. We say "even here," with tenacious adherence to the proper meaning and primary bearing of the psalm as a whole. We keep steadily before us the king-led league of nations in desperate conspiracy—the future time and sub-celestial place destined for the enthronisation of Jehovah's Son

* Heb. *resha'*, laxity, lawlessness, godlessness: LXX. ἀνομία.

Digitized by Google

—the thoroughness with which this Coming Revolution will terminate long ages of feeble and lawless government; and striving thus to realise how different a sphere we are moving in from that furnished by the standing New Testament message of mercy to individuals, we yet observe with profound joy that we are everywhere studying the ways of one and the same God. And so even these kings and judges must be *admonished*, because of the divine reluctance to smite! Determined lawlessness must be smitten and utterly broken: the Father has full confidence in his Son that this shall be loyally and efficiently done, and even makes this his confidence a chief reason for giving the kingdom into his hands; and, therefore, the Son's wrath against this blasting lawlessness in the government of the earth is something really to be dreaded. Should it kindle—it soon may—utter destruction will be its infliction. The sceptre is of iron, strong, resistless. Foes are doomed. Friends are safe. The same sceptre is strong to protect, strong to smite. The inheritance will be redeemed, even with judgment. The desolators of that inheritance must be destroyed, unless they will be warned, and will repent in time. But mercy lingers. Nevertheless lawlessness *must* be ENDED. The lawless may go one step too far.

* JOSEPH B. ROTHERHAM.

---

## NOTES AND COMMENTS.

### A LESSON IN SHOES.

FROM Germany *via* America comes the following good story, which many theologians among ourselves may usefully ponder:

There lived forty years ago, in Berlin, a shoemaker who had a habit of speaking harshly of all his neighbours who did not feel exactly as he did about religion. The old pastor of the parish in which the shoemaker lived heard of this, and felt that he must give him a lesson.

He did it in this way. He sent for the shoemaker one morning, and when he came in said to him:

"Master, take my measure for a pair of boots."

"With pleasure, your reverence," answered the shoemaker, "please take off your boot."

The clergyman did so, and the shoemaker measured his foot from toe to heel, and over the instep, noted all down in his pocket-book, and then prepared to leave the room.

But as he was putting up the measure the pastor said to him:

"Master, my son also requires a pair of boots."

"I will make them with pleasure, your reverence. Can I take the young man's measure?"

"It is not necessary," said the pastor; "the lad is fourteen, but you can make my boots and his from the same last."

"Your reverence, that will never do," said the shoemaker, with a smile of surprise.

"I tell you, sir, to make my son's on the same last."

"No, your reverence, I cannot do it."

"It must be—on the same last."

"But, your reverence, it is not possible, if the boots are to fit," said

Digitized by Google

the shoemaker, thinking to himself that the old pastor's wits were leaving him.

"Ah, then, master shoemaker," said the clergyman, "every pair of boots must be made on their own last, if they are to fit; and yet you think that God is to form all Christians exactly according to your own last, of the same measure and growth in religion as yourself. That will not do, either."

The shoemaker was abashed. Then he said:

"I thank your reverence for this sermon, and I will try to remember it, and to judge my neighbours less harshly in the future."

### THE PENALTY OF SIN PAID BY CHRIST.

In reference to the statement made by Mr. Charles Underhill in the Rainbow for October, on which his whole argument seems to depend, Mr. Dobson, in a letter to us, says:—"Mr. Underhill's premises are these: 'The necessity of an atonement is based upon the fact that the claims of law or of divine justice must be satisfied before it is possible for the divine clemency to be extended towards the sinner: *whatever penalties* have been incurred by man the sinner, it is necessary that these penalties should be borne by the substitute, and when these requirements have been fully satisfied then God can be just, as well as the justifier of the ungodly.' Now, assuming the necessity of the substitute bearing 'whatever penalty' man has incurred by sin; and assuming further, that *eternal death*, in its simple sense is everlasting destruction of body and soul in Gehenna,—both which assumptions are Mr. Underhill's own,—how can it be affirmed that in this case, any more than in *eternal torment*, the divine substitute bore the full penalty of sin?"—seeing that we most surely believe that Christ not only died, but "rose again," and is now "alive for evermore." This difficulty seems to us fairly put, and we are anxious to learn how it can be met.

### A LAST WORD—PERSONAL.

Though we live in a world of *partings*, parting, in a sense, with our sensuous life each night as we lie down to sleep; parting, as the years roll on, with old pursuits, old associations, and old friends; yea—as far at least as this life is concerned—even though those friends be brethren in Christ: yet neither use nor wont can make the act of parting other than sad, or dull the keen edge of the regret with which we sever the present from the future. It is not without such a feeling of sadness, and in some respects of regret, that we have here to notify the fact that the union of "The Rainbow" and "Our Hope," which has now subsisted for three years, is henceforth by mutual consent dissolved, mainly in consequence of a clearer apprehension of the wide divergencies of teaching and opinion between the two schools of thought which we have endeavoured harmoniously to present, and that therefore what have been called the "star papers"—the signatures having an asterisk prefixed—will cease to appear in these pages. To those—for we know there are some—who have derived from them some rays of instruction, comfort, and hope, we may hold out the possibility of meeting them again under other conditions; but in the meanwhile it only remains for us to bid them, and all the readers of the Rainbow—a sincerely brotherly Farewell.

14, Moray Road, Tollington Park, N. William Maude.

Digitized by Google

## SCRIPTURE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Whom does Paul say he preached? | 1. We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord. (2 Cor. iv. 5.) |
| 2. What does Paul say he is not ashamed of? | 2. I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ. (Rom. i. 16.) |
| 3. What does Jesus say it is to know God? | 3. Life Eternal. (John xvii. 3.) |
| 4. When Jesus sent the disciples to preach, what did he promise? | 4. Lo I am with you alway. (Matt. xxviii. 20.) |
| 5. What did Jesus tell the Jews he was? | 5. I am the Light of the World. (John viii. 12.) |
| 6. What does John say was made by Jesus Christ? | 6. All things. (John i. 3.) |
| 7. What did Jesus say was his meat? | 7. My meat is to do the will of him who sent me. (John iv. 34.) |
| 8. In what does Solomon say there is profit? | 8. Labour. (Prov. xiv. 23.) |
| 9. What does Solomon say is pure? | 9. Every word of God. (Prov. xxx. 5.) |
| 10. What does Jesus say to his disciples? | 10. Abide in me and I in you. (John xv. 4.) |
| 11. What does Jesus say of the fruitful hearers of the Gospel? | 11. Seed are the children of the kingdom. (Matt. xiii. 38.) |
| 12. What does John in the Revelation say Jesus is? | 12. King of kings. (Rev. xix. 16.) |

The Initials of the Answers give the name of the Minister of Maberly Chapel, Balls Pond Road. S. J. T.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### TWELVE AT £5 EACH.

*To the Readers of the* RAINBOW.

ESTEEMED FRIENDS,—Anxious to increase the circulation of the RAINBOW for the ensuing year, as well as to meet the deficiency that may result from the separation of "Our Hope" from its pages, I propose to make one of twelve to contribute £5 each towards the fund for the ensuing year. If eleven others interested in its maintenance and the spread of the doctrines it advocates will entrust me with their donations it will be my pleasure, at the earliest possible date, to hand our esteemed Editor a cheque for £60. Smaller donations will be gladly acknowledged, but to subscribers of £5 I engage that six copies of the RAINBOW per month shall be forwarded, post free, for gratuitous distribution; or three copies monthly to subscribers of £2 10s. Faithfully yours,

N. STARKEY.

29, Devonshire Road, Hackney, N.

P.S.—Cheques should be crossed London and County Bank, and P.O.O. made payable at 305, Mare Street, Hackney, E.

### "THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF SALVATION."

SIR,—In reply to the queries of Mr. James Lamb in your present issue, I would first of all remark that the study of dispensational truth is a necessary item in the education of children of God. To fuse the principles of diverse ages, law and grace, shadow and substance, promise and fulfilment, is not "rightly dividing the word of truth." The case of John the Baptist strongly confirms the above. He lived at the close of the legal

Digitized by Google

age, and died before the crucifixion that brought it to an end. Yet he was not in the kingdom, because he had not the privilege of consciousness of redemption by the blood of Christ, and forgiveness of sins. (Compare Luke vii. 28, with Col. i. 13, 14.) He, with the patriarchs and elect of Israel, are resting in their graves till, at the resurrection, they "shall look on him that was pierced," believe and be saved, being consciously washed in the "fountain for sin," that *in that day* "will be opened." (Zech. xii. 10, xiii. 1.)

From Adam to the advent of Christ no means had been found for the establishment of man in righteousness before God, or there would have been no need of a Saviour Christ. All was probation. But "*in due time* Christ died," bringing to light the only way whereby men could be saved. There was "no justification by deeds of law." Sinners are justified by faith in "*God, who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead*," and hence "peace with God." (Rom. iv. 24, 25; v. 1.) Peace is the consciousness of salvation freely received by grace *through faith in the blood of Christ*. (Rom. iii. 20-25 should be studied.)

Again; there was a long period "*before faith came*" as a principle of salvation; from Moses to Christ men were "shut up under law *unto* (in view of) THE FAITH, that should *afterwards be revealed*." THAT "faith of Jesus Christ" by which only the promise of life could be given. (Gal. iii. 21-23.) How could men believe on that which was not accomplished? "Abraham believed *God*, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." (Rom. iv. 3.) Neither he nor the saints of old received life or peace, but, they "obtained *a good report*" through their faith. (Heb. xi. 2.)

The Apostle Peter says that the prophets of old, who "testified of the sufferings and glory of Christ," knew nothing of the blessings that should result therefrom; it remained for "us," who live in an age of redemption *finished*, to partake of them through the Gospel "ministered by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven." (1 Pet. i. 10-12.)

2. In regard to the disciples of the Lord, Mr. Lamb has not quoted any Scripture tending to prove their *consciousness* of salvation. The Lord Jesus told them that there was no such thing as living union with Him in flesh and blood, for "except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, *it abideth alone*;" it is *in resurrection* that it "bringth forth much fruit." He summed up their creed in the words of John, xiv. 1.

3. In my paper I connected the passage John xx. 17-20 with Levit. xvi. because they stand related as type and antitype. I cannot enter into details, they are fully described in my "Antitypical Parallels," pp. 293-298. But Mr. Lamb can see in the typical history that the (symbolic) forgiveness of Israel's sins was only declared after Aaron had first entered Jehovah's presence with the blood of Jehovah's goat—ver. 8—and had *come forth again in token of acceptance* as the national representative.

With regard to the *supposed* difficulty attendant on the descent of the Lord Jesus from the presence of God on that eventful day, I have nothing to do. I am perfectly persuaded of the necessity for the entire action in order that, as the proto-evangelist, he might give assurance of reconciliation. I have only recorded events, and supported my statements from Scripture.

I am, Sir, faithfully yours,

H. GOODWYN.

Clevedon, 1st Nov. 1878.

Digitized by Google

## Literature.

*Manly Piety.* A Book for Young Men. By Robert Philip, D.D. Introductory Essay by Albert Barnes. Memoir by his Son. New and Revised Edition. London: G. Philip & Son, Fleet St.

Of this book itself—which was well known many years ago, and deserves to be well known still—we need say no more than that it combines deep thought with practical application, and that young men who take it as their guide will find it better than a golden fortune. Of the Memoir, however, we must just say a word. It is a model of graceful composition in which the writer represses filial admiration that the facts may speak for themselves. It must be a holy gratification to Mr. Joseph Philip to have rendered this loving tribute to the memory of his distinguished father. We wish for the book a large sale, because we love young men, and desire to see them armed for the conflict and crowned with victory. "Manly Piety" tells them all about it.

*The Destiny of the Wicked.* By A. M. Wilson. Hamilton, Adams, & Co.

This little book is a criticism on Mr. Cox's *Salvator Mundi.* It contends, with respectable ability, against Universalism. The Word of God is perfectly plain and clear respecting the destruction of the wicked; and Mr. Wilson sees this, although he has a good deal to learn about the revealed future.

## NOTICES.

The first of the "Berwick Lectures" on Israel in Britain, by C. M., will appear next month. We could not give it in full this month, and as the subject is so interesting we wished to avoid dividing the lecture.

A Subscriber forwards the following letter, extracted from a local paper. Perhaps some of our readers would like to say a word about it. —"Gentlemen,—Could any of the readers of your paper give me any account of the period or periods at which the Prophecies of Zechariah and the Epistle of St. Jude were translated from the Greek to the Latin? My reasons for asking this question are that on careful comparison of the passage in the Epistle of Jude, 9th verse, relative to the Archangel Michael disputing with Satan respecting the body of Moses, with the 3rd chapter of Zechariah, verses 1 to 5, I am led to the conclusion that some translator of the Epistle of Jude, ignorant of what occurs in Zechariah, and thinking only of Joshua, the successor of Moses, has come to the conclusion that Moses was meant and not Joshua, and thus has substituted the name of Moses for what should have been Joshua, who, I believe, was the first High Priest after the restoration of the Jews from the captivity of Babylon. This view is still further substantiated by the 23rd verse of the Epistle of Jude, where you again find the expressions of "brand plucked from the fire" and "garment spotted by the flesh," corresponding to the passages relating to Joshua. Should this view prove correct, it will render clear what has hitherto proved a most difficult passage to commentators. I should feel much obliged if you could give this letter space in your paper, to elicit, if possible, further light on the subject.—I am, Gentlemen, yours, &c., W. Carter. —Masham Bedale."

CHALONER AND COOKE, PRINTERS, 7, OXFORD ARMS PASSAGE, ST. PAUL'S.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google